Volume XLII] *October, 1936* [*Number 1*

The American Historical Review

THE BYZANTINIZATION OF SICILY

THE history of the mass migrations which disturbed the Mediterranean in the seventh century remains to be written. Our present knowledge of the great shifts of population from East to West, the displacement of Greeks by Semites and of Latins by Greeks, is exasperatingly small. While the general outline of these movements is clear, the details can seldom be determined with any certainty. In the study of them, Sicily is of the greatest importance. Almost blocking the narrow passage between the eastern and western basins of the Mediterranean, the island received the full impact of that wave of Greeks and Greek influences which swept westward, temporarily submerging the Latinity of North Africa, Southern Italy, and of Rome itself, and completely ousting the Latin element from Sicily and Lower Calabria. An examination of the Sicilian evidence may therefore help to define the more general problems and to throw some light on how, when, and why this Byzantine inundation took place.

I

Was the population of Sicily predominantly Greek- or Latin-speaking at the end of the sixth century? By happy coincidence we have an invaluable source for the study of Sicilian social history at just that time: the *Registrum* of Gregory I (590-604). The see of Rome possessed enormous estates on the island, and Gregory's private patrimony there was so extensive that with it he was able to build and endow six monasteries.[1] More than two hundred of Gregory's letters refer to Sicily. From them we get what would seem to be a most intimate picture of its life. Surely from such a wealth of documents we might expect an answer to our question. And indeed a perusal of the *Registrum* supplies a partial one. The vast majority of proper names are Latin;

[1] Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, bk. X, ch. 1, ed. by W. Arndt and B. Krusch in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*, I, 407.

the only evidence of Greeks permanently settled in Sicily shows that they lived where we should expect to find them, in Catania and Syracuse on the Ionian Sea, where merchants would naturally be found,[2] and at the centers of imperial administration.[3] Gregory's letters would lead us to the conclusion that about the year 600 Sicily was overwhelmingly Latin.

The excavations of recent decades, however, have supplied much new material and have forced us to modify this opinion drastically.[4] The inscriptions from Messina, Catania, and Syracuse show that as late as the fifth century A. D. everywhere along the east coast of the island a majority of the people spoke Greek. As one approaches its southern tip, the proportion of Greek inscriptions increases; in the catacombs of Syracuse, the most important city of Sicily, they outnumber the Latin ten to one. The astonishing number of Latin names on these Greek tombstones shows how easily we may be misled regarding the ordinary language of the "Latins" found in Gregory's letters.[5]

Except along the east coast the epigraphic material is as yet too scarce to warrant conclusions. But there is evidence hitherto unexploited which indicates that at the end of the sixth century the Hellenic population had maintained itself on the south coast as well, for at Agrigento (Girgenti), the ancient Akragas, we find a Greek bishop. The proof of this turns on the problem of the proper date of St. Gregory of Agrigento, the author

[2] *Gregorii I papae registrum epistolarum*, Ep. IX, 26, ed. by P. Ewald and L. M. Hartmann, *M. G. H., Epp.*, II, 59. The *Registrum* twice mentions oriental transients in Sicily: a debt-ridden Syrian merchant named Cosmas (Ep. IV, 43, *ibid.*, I, 278) and a group of Monophysites from Alexandria (Ep. XII, 16, *ibid.*, II, 362). The Latin tombstone of an Alexandrian cloth-merchant in Palermo is dated 602. *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*, vol. X^2, no. 7330.

[3] The pope replies to a Greek communication from Zitta, *magister militum* in Sicily. Ep. X, 10, *M. G. H., Epp.*, II, 245.

[4] The admirable recent work of Gerhard Rohlfs, *Scavi linguistici nella Magna Grecia* (Rome, 1933), especially pp. 129-131, makes it superfluous to examine the archaeological evidence here in any detail. Rohlfs's central thesis, that the Greek tongue was used continuously in Southern Italy and Sicily in Roman times, is now generally accepted. Unfortunately his reaction against the older theory that Southern Italy was completely Romanized for several centuries has led him to minimize the importance of the oriental immigration of the early Middle Ages (p. 147). Consequently his attempt to account for the remarkable revival of Hellenism in these regions during the seventh century (p. 136) is unsatisfactory.

[5] See the Greek index of Vincenzo Strazzulla, *Museum epigraphicum seu inscriptionum Christianarum quae Syracusanis in catacumbis repertae sunt corpusculum* (Palermo, 1897), in *Documenti per servire alla storia di Sicilia*, ser. 3, vol. III. Similar ambiguity prevents us from drawing any conclusion from the names in three Latin papyri of the late fifth century which concern Sicily, in Gaetano Marini, *I papiri diplomatici* (Rome, 1805), nos. 73, 82, 83, and in Biagio Pace, "I barbari ed i bizantini in Sicilia", *Archivio storico siciliano*, XXXVI (1911), 59-68.

of an extant Greek commentary on *Ecclesiastes*.[6] The memory of this St. Gregory is enshrined in a lengthy and ecstatic *vita* by Leontius, abbot of the Greek monastery of St. Saba in Rome.[7] Despite his vivid style and wealth of detail, Leontius has not given us a single chronological indication; even his proper names are so full of anachronisms as to make the biography almost worthless to the historian. It contains, however, one incident which seems to show when the bishop of Agrigento lived. From Syria, whither he had gone to practice the monastic life, Gregory went to Rome. Shortly thereafter the pope made him bishop of his native Agrigento. But in Sicily Bishop Gregory made enemies, who sought revenge by compromising him with a woman and then denouncing him to the pope. Gregory was taken to Rome and long imprisoned, awaiting trial. Finally he was acquitted, and returned to his see, where he lived to an advanced age. Now the register of Gregory I reveals an almost identical case. In August, 591, the pope ordered three bishops, Gregory of Agrigento, Leo of Catania, and Victor of Palermo, to appear before his Sicilian vicar for trial.[8] The cases were carried to Rome. On July 5, 592, Leo of Catania was acquitted, and by April, 593, Victor had returned to Palermo.[9] Not so Gregory of Agrigento; in November, 592, the pope was still attempting to secure the presence of his accusers in Rome so that the trial might be held.[10] Two years later Gregory must still have been in duress, for in November, 594, the pope appointed

[6] *Sancti Gregorii II Agrigentinorum episcopi explanationes Ecclesiastae libri decem*, Stefano Antonio Morcelli, ed. (Venice, 1791), reprinted in J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. XCVIII, cols. 742-1181.

[7] Morcelli, ed., *ibid.*, cols. 549-716. Leontius's genius for obfuscation has wrapped his own history in as great obscurity as that of his hero. Morcelli (cols. 541-546) has ingeniously discovered a monk Leontius in Rome about 680, and believes him to have been at St. Saba's; but the name is too common to be convincing proof of identity. From internal evidence it would seem that the *vita* was written in the Orient rather than at Rome (Morcelli, col. 547 and Domenico Gaspare Lancia di Brolo, *Storia della chiesa in Sicilia nei dieci primi secoli*, Palermo, 1880-1884, II, 54). There is no indication of the date of its composition. The earliest extant MS. is of the eighth-ninth centuries (Karl Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*, Munich, 1897, p. 129). I am inclined to believe that it was written after the separation of Sicily from the western patriarchate (see p. 20), for one passage (Morcelli, col. 665) intimates that a Sicilian bishop could not be tried in Rome without the consent of the patriarch of Constantinople and of the eastern emperor.

[8] Ep. I, 70, *M. G. H., Epp.*, I, 90. The bishops were embroiled with Justin, praetor of Sicily, an unsavory character (Ep. III, 37, *ibid.*, I, 195), evidently quite capable of "framing" Gregory. The garbled oral tradition of this incident probably furnished the nucleus of Leontius's story.

[9] Epp. II, 30 and III, 27, *ibid.*, pp. 126, 184.

[10] Ep. III, 12, *ibid.*, p. 171.

Bishop Peter of Triocala as visitor for the diocese of Agrigento.[11] By January of 603 Gregory was free, for a Sicilian bishop of the same name is referred to under circumstances which point decisively to his identity with our Bishop Gregory and to his long-continued occupation of the see of Agrigento.[12] Gregory may have been free as early as 598.[13]

The vicissitudes of Leontius's saint and of the Bishop Gregory of the papal register are so similar that it is difficult to doubt their identity. Lancia di Brolo, however, combats such a conclusion with linguistic and liturgical arguments: in his commentary on *Ecclesiastes,* Bishop Gregory

[11] Ep. V, 12, *ibid.,* I, 293. Archbishop Lancia di Brolo (I, 388, n. 5), who opposes the identification of Leontius's Gregory with the bishop of the *Registrum,* asserts that Peter's appointment indicates that Gregory of Agrigento had been deposed. But in such a case the pope would certainly have ordered the election of a new bishop for so important a see. Lancia di Brolo (II, 48) further insists that Bishop Gregory had been deposed because in June, 595 (Ep. V, 40, *M. G. H., Epp.,* I, 331), the pope offered an unnamed vacant see in Sicily to the fugitive Bishop Sebastian of Resina, who did not accept. But Lancia di Brolo is wrong in believing that this can only refer to Agrigento: on the contrary Bishop Agatho of Lipari had been deposed in 592 (Ep. II, 19, *ibid.,* I, 115; *cf.* p. 51, n. 1) and no successor is known; also we have no record of a bishop at Lentini before 602 (Ep. XII, 15, *ibid.,* II, 362).

[12] Ep. XIII, 22, *ibid.,* p. 388. In this letter the pope introduces Adrian, the new Syracusan *defensor* of papal estates in that part of the island, to seven Sicilian bishops. From other letters we can positively identify the sees of six of these: Catania, Taormina, Syracuse, Messina, Lentini, and Malta. Lipari and Tindari are never mentioned in connection with the *defensores,* presumably because there were no papal estates in those small dioceses. On the other hand a letter of October, 598 (Ep. IX, 29, *ibid.,* p. 62), specifically entrusts to a new Syracusan *defensor* the properties of the Roman church "in partibus Syracusanis, Catenensibus, Agrigentinis vel Messanensibus". Lancia di Brolo (I, 470, n. 1) is therefore wrong in asserting that the diocese of Agrigento was in the jurisdiction of the *defensor* of Palermo. The one letter (Ep. VIII, 23, *M. G. H., Epp.,* II, 24) which can be adduced to support such a view is dated May, 598, and deals with an exceptional situation, since the defensorship of Syracuse was then vacant (see above). The seventh bishop, named Gregory, in our letter of January, 603, is therefore Gregory of Agrigento.

This is not a new Bishop Gregory, for the pope addresses the bishops in order of seniority, and Gregory ranks first, taking precedence over Leo of Catania and Secundinus of Taormina, both of whom were occupying their sees in 591 (Epp. I, 70, 71, *ibid.,* I, 90-91). Lipari's bishop was deposed in 592 (above, n. 11), while at Tindari Benenatus succeeded Eutychius between 593 and 599 (Epp. III, 59, and IX, 180, *ibid.,* I, 218 and II, 174).

Lancia di Brolo (II, 50), led astray by the Maurine edition of the *Registrum,* is likewise in error in maintaining that the Bishop Exhilaratus, mentioned in September, 603, as being in the jurisdiction of the Palermitan *defensor* (Ep. XIV, 4, *ibid.,* II, 423), must have been bishop of Agrigento. Bishop Peter of Triocala last appears in October, 598 (Ep. IX, 21, *ibid.,* p. 55), while Bishop Decius of Lilybaeum is not mentioned after August, 599 (Ep. IX, 233, *ibid.,* p. 228). In neither case is the successor known. Therefore Exhilaratus may have been bishop either of Triocala or of Lilybaeum.

[13] Ep. VIII, 23, *ibid.,* p. 24.

cites only the oriental Fathers, and he uses the form of eucharistic institution found in the Greek Mass,[14] whereas "Sicily for the entire sixth century and sometime after observed exclusively the liturgy and the rite of the Roman church".[15]

As we have seen, excavations since Lancia di Brolo's time have disposed of the linguistic difficulty. But what was the customary rite of Sicily at the end of the sixth century?[16] The evidence is scanty and ambiguous. The popes made sporadic efforts to enforce Roman liturgical usages in Southern Italy and Sicily, but with doubtful success. In 447 Leo I wrote to the bishops of Sicily, rebuking them for permitting baptism at Epiphany, as the Greeks did, and ordering them to observe the Roman custom of baptizing on Easter and Whitsunday, "quam culpam nullo modo potuissetis incidere si . . . beati Petri apostoli sedes, quae vobis sacerdotalis mater est dignitatis, esset ecclesiasticae magistra rationis".[17] In 494 Gelasius I was fighting the extension of the same Byzantine habit not merely in Sicily, but in Calabria and Lucania as well.[18] Evidently the local clergy paid little attention to papal wishes in such matters, and the custom spread. A century later, under Gregory the Great, baptism seems to have been administered at Epiphany with great pomp in the church of Naples.[19] It would therefore be unsafe to assume that papal commands in liturgical matters were actually conformed to. In 598, however, Pope Gregory does specifically assert that the Roman rite was then used in the churches of Syracuse, and by implication in those of all Sicily: "Nam vestrae ecclesiae numquid traditionem a Graecis acceperunt? Unde habent ergo hodie, ut subdiaconi lineis in tunicis procedant, nisi quia hoc a matre sua Romana ecclesia perceperunt?"[20] But such rhetorical questions are not to be taken too seriously; Gregory is defending the Roman church from the charge of imitating certain features of the Greek rite. At least once in this very letter he chooses to disregard an actual case of oriental liturgical infiltration in the transfer of the Pater Noster to the end of the Canon, which, as Duchesne remarks, "had the effect of bringing the Roman use into con-

[14] Migne, *Pat. Gr., vol.* XCVIII, Morcelli's note 99, col. 837.

[15] Lancia di Brolo, II, 51.

[16] A discussion of the older controversial literature will be found in Adrian Fortescue, *The Uniate and Eastern Churches: the Byzantine Rite in Italy, Sicily, Syria, and Egypt* (London, 1923), p. 73, n. 1.

[17] P. Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum*, S. Loewenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner, and P. Ewald, eds. (Leipzig, 1885), no. 414; also in Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, vol. LIV, col. 696.

[18] Jaffé, no. 636; Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, vol. LIX, col. 52.

[19] G. Morin, "La liturgie de Naples au temps de S. Grégoire", *Revue Bénédictine*, VIII (1891), 533-534.

[20] Ep. IX, 26, *M. G. H., Epp.*, II, 59.

formity with that of Constantinople".[21] It seems impossible, then, to reach any certainty regarding the Sicilian rite at the end of the sixth century. Probably it was the Roman, somewhat modified by eastern practices. It may even at times have been celebrated in Greek; a manuscript from Rossano preserves a Greek translation of the Roman Mass in its late seventh century form.[22]

In any case, the commentary on *Ecclesiastes* of Gregory of Agrigento does not mean that an oriental liturgy was used at Agrigento in his day. There is no evidence that it was written after he became bishop there; it may easily have been composed in one of those Palestinian or Syrian monasteries where, if Leontius is to be trusted, Gregory stayed for a considerable time before his return to the Occident.[23]

There is no reason to doubt, therefore, that from before 591 until after 603 our learned Greek exegete occupied the bishopric of Agrigento. His election to that see would mean that there was at that time a considerable Greek-speaking population in southern Sicily.[24] This, with the archaeological evidence from the east coast, indicates that Gregory I's *Registrum* does not give us a wholly accurate picture of the contemporary Sicilian population. The pope was corresponding with the officials, the papal agents, the bishops and abbots and wealthy laymen of the island. This ruling class was probably far more Latinized than were the common people. The foundations of Sicily, at least in the east and south, were Greek; only the superstructure was Latin.[25] It is this

[21] Louis Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, tr. by M. L. McClure (London, 1919), p. 184.

[22] Pierre Batiffol, *L'abbaye de Ros.ıno* (Paris, 1891), p. xi.

[23] Leontius (Migne, *Pat. Gr.*, vol. XCVIII, col. 597) specifically tells us that during his year's residence at Antioch Gregory was busied with dogmatic writings which by their learning amazed the scholars of that city.

[24] Despite Lancia di Brolo's labors, not a shred of evidence has yet been produced to prove the existence of a second Gregory of Agrigento in the Byzantinized Sicily of the late seventh century. Niceta Pectoratus, *Contra Latinos*, in Migne, *Pat. Gr.*, vol. CXX, col. 1018, speaks of the Sixth Ecumenical Council in 680 "praesidente synodo Agathone papa Romae et Gregorio cum eis Agrigentinorum episcopo praesidente" (Greek text not extant), but the records of the council contain no such name. Cardinal Baronius, *Martyrologium Romanum* (Rome, 1586) under November 23, says that in 680 Bishop Gregory of Agrigento signed a synodal with Pope Agatho, but this is a misreading for Bishop George of Agrigento, who likewise attended a Roman council in 679. Lancia di Brolo, II, 53, n. 1; William Smith and Henry Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (London, 1877-1887) II, 777.

[25] Additional evidence of the continued use of the Greek tongue in the island is to be found in the manuscript tradition of the New Testament. The latest criticism ascribes the Codex Bezae and the Codex Claromontanus (both of fifth-sixth century origin) to Sicily. James Hardy Ropes, *The Text of Acts*, vol. III of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, pt. I, *The Acts of the Apostles*, ed. by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (London, 1926), pp. lix-lxviii.

persistence of the Hellenic element in Sicily which explains the astonishing rapidity and permanence with which the island was Byzantinized in the first half of the seventh century by successive waves of immigrants from the Levant.

II

The documentation of these westward movements is as yet most inadequate, and the chances of error regarding them are great. The discussion has already passed through several stages. The first scholar to attract general attention to the "second Hellenization of Magna Graecia", François Lenormant, asserted that its agents were refugees, particularly iconodulic monks, fleeing the wrath of the iconoclastic emperors of the eighth century.[26] Unfortunately Lenormant's most striking proofs of monastic migration to Italy at that time were derived from an eighteenth century forgery designed to enhance the reputation of a miraculous ikon in Bari.[27] Moreover the researches of Charles Diehl refuted Lenormant's contention that despite Byzantine rule, Italy was almost unaffected by oriental influences for two hundred years after Justinian's conquest of the Goths.[28] Louis Bréhier and Paolo Orsi then decided that the process of Hellenization dated back to the middle of the sixth century.[29]

This view in turn is being modified. Of course there had long been oriental commercial colonies in the West, and eastern pilgrims had frequented the shrines of SS. Peter and Paul. But no proof has yet been offered that Sicily or Italy, outside the exarchal city of Ravenna, was profoundly affected by Byzantinism before the seventh century. Under Pope Gregory I, after fifty years of Greek domination, Rome was a very Latin city. Two generations later it was truly "une ville byzantine",[30] and Sicily, which in Gregory's day contained a considerable Latin element, had become completely Greek in language, rite, and culture.

The cause of this metamorphosis was an influx of Greek-speaking immigrants, both lay and clerical, from Syria and Egypt. From 614 onward the Levant suffered a series of fearful convulsions any one of which would have forced thousands of refugees across the sea.[31] The

[26] *La Grande-Grèce* (Paris, 1881), I, vii and II, 371-400.

[27] Batiffol, p. v.

[28] Diehl, *Études sur l'administration byzantine dans l'exarchat de Ravenne*, 568-751 (Paris, 1888), esp. pp. 241-288; Lenormant, II, 382.

[29] Bréhier, "Les colonies d'orientaux en occident au commencement du moyen-âge", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XII (1903), 8; Orsi, "Byzantina Siciliae", *ibid.*, XIX (1910), 475.

[30] Bréhier, *loc. cit.*

[31] See especially the brilliant sketch of Jules Gay, "Notes sur la crise du monde chrétien après les conquêtes arabes", *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XLV (1928), 1-7.

first disaster was the Persian invasion under Khusrau II. The Sassanid armies spread terror throughout Syria. The churches particularly suffered. In the famous abbey of St. Saba, on the road between Jerusalem and Jericho, forty-four monks were tortured to death; Antiochus, one who escaped, tells how he and other survivors fled from place to place, seeking safety.[32] Alexandria was filled with Syrians, clergy and laymen, living on the bounty of Patriarch John of that city.[33] But the relentless Persians advanced southward to the Nile and destroyed a great part of the monasteries of Egypt as well.[34] We know the name of one monk, John Moschus, who had retreated from Palestine to Antioch, then from Antioch to Alexandria. When in 617 the invaders besieged Alexandria itself, he fled westward to Rome.[35] Presumably he was only one of many who did likewise.

It is noteworthy that the migration to the Occident in the seventh century seems to have included almost no Coptic- or Syriac-speaking refugees; it was a purely Hellenic movement.[36] This is explained by the religious situation in the Orient at that time. The Greek-speaking population of the larger cities, particularly along the coast, had clung to Chalcedonian orthodoxy. The indigenous Copts and Syrians tended to adopt the Monophysite heresy. Politics and religion were inseparable: the orthodox party was also the imperialist (Melkite) faction; the Monophysites were by reason of their heresy traitors to Byzantium. In faith, language, and political allegiance the schism between the two groups became increasingly sharp. "The key to the whole of this epoch is the antagonism between the Monophysites and the Melkites."[37]

After the first tempest of war had passed, the Persians used these

[32] Migne, *Pat. Gr.*, vol. LXXXIX, cols. 1422-1428.

[33] See the excerpt from John Moschus's life of John the Almoner in H. Gelzer, *Leontios von Neopolis Leben des heiligen Johannes des Baumherzigen, Erzbishofs von Alexandrien* (Freiburg i. B., 1893), p. 112; Hippolyte Delehaye, "Une vie inédite de saint Jean l'Aumônier", *Analecta Bollandiana*, XLV (1927), 21-22.

[34] *The History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria*, edited by B. T. A. Evetts (Paris, 1907), pp. 485-490; *The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt*, attributed to Abū Sālih the Armenian, ed. and tr. by B. T. A. Evetts and Alfred J. Butler (Oxford, 1895), p. 168; Alfred J. Butler, *The Arab Conquest of Egypt and the Last Thirty Years of the Roman Dominion* (Oxford, 1902), pp. 74-75.

[35] Krumbacher, p. 187.

[36] The heretical nuns from Alexandria found at Carthage in 641 by St. Maximus Confessor (Migne, *Pat. Gr.*, vol. XCI, cols. 459, 463, 466) may have been Greek-speaking Monothelites rather than Coptic Monophysites. A real exception may be the Syrian Nestorian monks discovered in Rome by Pope Donus (676-678); see *Liber pontificalis*, L. Duchesne, ed. (Paris, 1886), I, 348. If Monophysites went west to escape the Heraclian persecution, they seem to have returned east after the Arab conquest (see n. 45).

[37] Butler, *Arab Conquest*, p. 29.

divisions to strengthen their hold on the newly conquered provinces. Michael the Syrian tells us that "at the command of Khusrau all the Chalcedonian bishops were driven from the whole region of Mesopotamia and Syria. The churches and monasteries were given to the Jacobites".[38] The object was purely political, and persecution of the Melkites was directly instigated by the heretics. Al-Makīn tells us that Khusrau "had a Jacobite physician, John by name, who persuaded him that so long as [the Melkites] followed orthodoxy, they would incline towards the Romans"; so Khusrau offered the Chalcedonians the alternative of Jacobitism or death.[39] Evidently a similar policy was followed in Egypt, which the Persians ruled for more than a decade.[40] All this would doubtless stimulate emigration by the Greek minority.[41]

When the Emperor Heraclius finally drove back the Persians, he determined to unify the orthodox and heretical churches at all costs. To this end he promulgated in 629 the theological compromise known as Monothelitism. The Jacobites and Copts, whose antipathy to the Empire was as much political as religious, would have nothing to do with it and were ruthlessly persecuted in return. But worse, Heraclius split the Greek-speaking Melkites. The extreme orthodox group, having suffered such tribulations for the faith under Khusrau, was adamant against this new attempt to dilute the Christology of Chalcedon. Led by the monk Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem, it bitterly opposed the emperor's heresy and suffered a persecution which sent another wave of refugee clerics to Rome, the traditional bulwark of orthodoxy. The late Erich Caspar has recently shown that the Roman synod of 649, which definitively condemned Monothelitism, was largely controlled by immigrant monks.[42]

Heraclius's fanaticism spent itself chiefly, however, on the Monophysites. For ten years he oppressed them brutally, particularly in Alex-

[38] *Chronique*, ed. and tr. by J. B. Chabot (Paris, 1901), II, 379; *cf.* pp. 380-381.

[39] *Historia Saracenica*, ed. and tr. by T. Erpenius (Leyden, 1625), p. 12.

[40] Michael the Syrian (*op. cit.*, p. 381) says "at that time the bishops of Syria who had been expelled by the Chalcedonians and had fled to Egypt returned to their sees in Syria by order of Khusrau". This would indicate a consistent Persian policy throughout the conquered regions. See Butler, *Arab Conquest*, p. 90.

[41] J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire, 395-800* (London, 1889), II, 249, and L. Caetani, *Annali dell' Islam*, II (Milan, 1907), 1048, agree in estimating the Egyptian Melkites under Heraclius at about 30,000, as compared with between five and six million Copts.

[42] "Die Lateransynode von 649", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LI (1932), 118-120. These refugees likewise brought the Syrian form of the crucifix to Rome and popularized its use in the West as the most adequate symbol of the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation. Louis Bréhier, *Les origines du crucifix dans l'art religieux* (Paris, 1908), p. 59.

andria. He reaped his reward when the armies of Islam, advancing through Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, were greeted as liberators.[43] The invaders clearly understood the advantage they might draw from internal strife; the contemporary history of the Coptic patriarchs informs us that "the Muslims kept their hands off the province and its inhabitants, but destroyed the nation of the Romans".[44] The Arab commander 'Amr requested, and received, the prayers of the Coptic patriarch for the speedy conquest of Cyrenaica and the rest of North Africa. In fact many Monophysites who had fled to the Pentapolis and even farther west to escape the persecution of Heraclius now returned to live in peace under Moslem masters.[45]

The Greek-speaking population of Egypt, retreating before the militant Arabs and hostile Copts, huddled in Alexandria.[46] In 642 the city capitulated. Under the terms of the treaty, a large part of the inhabitants departed with their goods.[47] It seems probable that some of them reached the West, although there is no clear evidence on the point.[48] The

[43] The contrary opinion of Butler, *Arab Conquest*, pp. 298, 357, 442, is not acceptable. In the late seventh century Bishop John of Nikiu (*Chronique*, ed. and tr. by Herman Zotenberg, Paris, 1883, p. 442) says: "Seeing the weakness of the Romans, and the hostility of the inhabitants towards the Emperor Heraclius because of the persecution he had inflicted on all Egypt against the orthodox [*i. e.*, Coptic] religion . . . the Moslems became bolder and stronger in battle". On page 464 he adds. "Everyone said that the expulsion [of the Romans] and the victory of the Moslems had been brought about by the tyranny of the Emperor Heraclius, and by the afflictions he had visited upon the orthodox [Copts]"; see also pp. 443, 449-450, 466. This is reprinted in *Notices et extraits des MSS., XXIV*[1] (Paris, 1883), 562-563, 569-570, 584-586.

The classic statement of the Jacobite attitude towards the Islamic conquest gains greater weight because it comes from the twelfth century, when the full effects of the Arab domination were visible. Michael the Syrian (*op. cit.*, II, 412-413) says: "The God of vengeance . . . beholding the wickedness of the Romans, who, wherever they ruled, cruelly pillaged our churches and monasteries and condemned us without mercy, brought from the southland the sons of Ishmael to deliver us by them from the hands of the Romans." Barhebraeus (*Chronicon ecclesiasticum*, J. B. Abbeloos and T. J. Lamy, eds., Louvain, 1872, I, 274) expresses identical sentiments in the thirteenth century. See also E. Amélineau, "Fragments coptes pour servire à l'histoire de la conquête de l'Égypte par les arabes", *Journal asiatique*, ser. 8, XII (1888), 361-410; and Caetani, *Annali*, II, 1049; III, 813; V, 394.

[44] Evetts, ed., p. 494.

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 496-497.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 494.

[47] Butler, *Arab Conquest*, pp. 358, 366.

[48] The oldest MS. of the Alexandrian Liturgy of St. Mark comes from Messina (that of the Antiochene Liturgy of St. James was found at Rossano); see Batiffol, p. xi. Myrtilla Avery, "The Alexandrian Style at Santa Maria Antiqua, Rome", *The Art Bulletin* of the College Art Association of America, VII (1925), 131-149, ascribes the second of the five layers of fresco in Santa Maria to Alexandrian artists of the first half of the

Mohammedan histories show that a large proportion of the Greeks left the conquered regions,[49] but it is difficult to distinguish the refugees in the Occident who retreated before the armies of Islam from those who had previously sought safety from the Persians and the persecution of Heraclius. The clearest data come from Carthage, where in 641 St. Maximus reports immigrants from Syria, Egypt, and Lybia.[50] Many of these were monks,[51] and in 649 we find in Rome Palestinian monks who had probably fled from Africa to escape the Saracen raid into Byzacium in 647.[52] We know definitely that Sicily received some of

seventh century. Since the third layer can be dated *ca.* 650, it is improbable that the second layer was the work of refugees fleeing the Moslems in 642. Although Miss Avery's attribution of the second fresco to the Alexandrian school is still under debate, the sharp contrast between the first and second frescoes is admirable evidence of the arrival in Rome before 650 of eastern immigrants.

[49] *E. g.*, al-Balādhurī, *Origins of the Islamic State*, tr. by Philip Khūri Hitti (New York, 1916), p. 180, says that Mu'āwiyah sent Semitic colonists from the interior to settle places along the seacoast of Syria deserted by the Greeks. Pages 194-195 tell how, when the Greeks evacuated Tripoli, a large colony of Jews took their place. Greek refugees are also mentioned from Damascus (p. 189), Antioch (p. 227), Alexandria (p. 348), and other cities (p. 232). The area of abandoned land in Syria was evidently considerable (p. 234).

[50] Migne, *Pat. Gr.*, vol. XCI, cols. 459, 466. On the date, see Charles Diehl, *L'Afrique byzantine* (Paris, 1896), p. 543, n. 1.

[51] Migne, *Pat. Gr., loc. cit.*, and col. 391. W. Seston, "Le monastère d'Aïn-Tamda et les origines de l'architecture monastique en Afrique du Nord", extract from *Mélanges d'Arch. et d'Hist.*, vol. LI (1934), describes a monastery in Caesarian Mauretania having a ground plan which originated among the small abbeys of South Syria, and which became typical of the Occident, as distinct from the Byzantine lands, which adopted the Egyptian arrangement. Seston points out that the channel by which the South-Syrian plan reached the West has not been traced. With great hesitancy he dates Aïn-Tamda in the fifth or sixth century, because he believes that a trident incised on two columns of the nave is a Trinitarian symbol aimed at the Arian Vandals. But it might equally be an anti-Monophysite or anti-Monothelite symbol. Since the Moslems did not reach the region of Aïn-Tamda before 683 (Diehl, *Afrique*, p. 578), the monastery may have been built by Syrian refugees in the first part of the seventh century.

[52] ". . . et prius quidem", they say, "dum Afrorum habitaremus provinciam". Mansi, *Conciliorum Collectio*, X, 906. Al-Bakrī ("Description de l'Afrique septentrionale", tr. by the Baron de Slane, *Journal asiatique*, ser. 5, XII [1858], 525) says that the Romans of Africa fled before the Arab attack to the island of Pantellaria, between Sicily and Africa. Michele Amari (*Storia dei musulmani di Sicilia*, Catania, 1933, I, 237) puts this in the year 669, but Diehl (*Afrique*, p. 561, n. 1) dates it 647. Since the Moslem conquest of North Africa was not completed until the early eighth century, emigration continued long from that region. A letter of Pope Gregory II, Dec. 1, 722, shows that African refugees were then common in Thuringia. Jaffé-Ewald, no. 2161; Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, vol. LXXXIX, col. 502; Léon Godard, "Observations critiques sur quelques points de l'histoire du christianisme en Afrique: I, Quels sont les Africains que le pope Grégoire II défendit en 723 d'élever au sacerdoce?", *Revue africaine*, V (1861), 48-53. We should not be astonished to find such expatriates north of the Alps. By 664 the Greek-speaking African

these North African fugitives, for in 643, when the Saracens seized Sabrantha in the Tripolitana, a small group sailed to the island for safety.[53]

After order had been restored in the provinces seized by Islam, the volume of the westward movement seems to have diminished greatly. Unlike the rulers of Persia and Byzantium, the early caliphs showed almost no religious fanaticism. Little pressure was exerted to convert Christians to Mohammedanism, factional strife was repressed, and all sects were treated with even-handed justice.[54] Indeed there was no inducement to migrate. The seventh and eighth centuries were artistically and intellectually a golden age not merely for the Monophysites of Syria and Egypt, but also for the remaining Melkites, as witness St. John of Damascus.

It is certain, however, that for thirty years at least, following the Persian invasion, Greeks kept arriving in North Africa, Sicily, Southern Italy, and Rome, and that as the Moslems advanced along the African coast, the refugees in that region joined those in the islands or in Europe. The size and importance of the Greek colonies formed by this migration is clearly seen in Rome. By the middle of the seventh century there were at least two, and probably three, oriental abbeys in the city; by 678 there were four.[55] From 678 to 752, or until after Ravenna had

Abbot Hadrian had sought safety in the Campania; four years later he and his friend Theodore, a Cilician monk, were sent to England by Pope Vitalian (Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica*, bk. IV, ch. 1, J. Stevenson, ed., London, 1838, pp. 243-244). An Irish litany of the tenth or eleventh century mentions seven Egyptian monks buried together at Disret Uilaig, who may likewise have been fugitives of the seventh century (C. Plummer, *Irish Litanies*, London, 1925, p. 64). *The Martyrology of Oengus the Culdee*, dating from about 800 (Whitley Stokes, ed., London, 1905, pp. 80, 86), records an Egyptian monk named Moses who seems, from the context, to have died in Ireland.

[53] Alphonse Rousseau, "Voyage du scheïkh Et-Tidjani dans la régence de Tunis", *Journal asiatique*, ser. 5, I (1853), 125-126. On at-Tijānī's credibility, see Amari, I, 233, n. 1.

The linguistic and cultural effect of such North African immigrants in northern lands is uncertain. St. Maximus's letters (see above, n. 50) would indicate that by 641 the classes which could migrate most easily were strongly Byzantinized. The Byzantine period furnishes a large number of Greek inscriptions, few of which can be dated exactly; see Paul Monceaux, "Enquête sur l'épigraphie chrétienne d'Afrique", *Revue archéologique*, ser. 4, II (1903), 65, and Walter Thieling, *Der Hellenismus in Kleinafrika* (Leipzig, 1911), pp. 55-56. Godard, *op. cit.*, p. 50, believes that "l'Église d'Afrique, durant le dernière période de son existance . . . était devenue en quelque sort greco-latine, par le mélange des byzantines avec le population africaine et par la langue de ses écrivains".

[54] Butler, *Arab Conquest*, pp. 447-448.

[55] F. Antonelli, "I primi monasteri di monaci orientali in Roma", *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, V (1929), 105-121. One of these, the *Renatum*, was Latin in the days of Gregory I.

fallen before the Lombards, out of thirteen popes, eleven were orientals. Diehl supposed that this astonishing series was due to pressure exerted by the Byzantine emperor or his exarch upon the Roman electors, but Gay has shown that there is evidence neither of such official influence nor of any unusual subservience on the part of the immigrant popes to imperial wishes. Gay himself explains the election of so many foreigners on the ground that the Latin clerics realized that they were too ignorant of theology to carry on subtle disputes and negotiations with heretical emperors.[56] Admitting that the Latin clergy was indeed less learned than the Greek, it is, nevertheless, incredible that for three quarters of a century the native Romans should have practiced such exemplary self-abnegation in the interest of an alien minority.[57] One is driven to the conclusion that in the later seventh and early eighth centuries the Orientals actually formed a majority of the Roman clergy and presumably of the more influential laity as well—a thesis which seems amply substantiated by the remains of the Rome of that period.[58]

Certain of these "Greek" popes were Sicilians, and their biographies in the *Liber pontificalis* are particularly valuable to us. The first of them, Agatho (678-681), is called simply "nationè Sicula". His successor, Leo II (682-683), was likewise a Sicilian, "greca latinaque lingua eruditus". Conon (686-687) came originally from the east coast of the Aegean but was educated in Sicily before he went to Rome. The biography of Sergius (687-701) is even more informative: "Sergius, natione Syrus, Antiochiae regionis, ortus ex patre Tiberio in Panormo Siciliae. . . . Romam veniens sub sanctae memoriae Adeodato pontifice [*i.e.*, between 672 and 676] inter clerum Romanae ecclesiae connumer-

[56] Diehl, *Ravenne*, 257-260; Gay "Quelques remarques sur les papes grecs et syriens avant la querelle des iconoclastes, 678-715", *Mélanges Schlumberger* (Paris, 1924), I, 44-46.

[57] Indeed a note of bitter resentment against the Greek immigrants and their popes has been left us from the late seventh century by a Latin Roman, who laments the departed glory of his city, and the

> Vulgus ab extremis destractum partibus orbis;
> Servorum servi nunc tibi sunt domini.

Published in Lodovico Antonio Muratori, *Antiquitates italicae medii aevi* (Milan, 1738), II, 147; for date see Ferdinand Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 1903), II, 153, n. 1.

[58] "Tout ce quartier de Rome, sur les flancs du Palatin, et jusqu'au pied du Capitole, est plein encore de monuments et de souvenirs, qui rapellent non seulment les temps de la domination byzantine, mais l'importance que garde, après la chute de l'exarchat, cette colonie orientale, d'où sont sortis les papes grecs et syriens". Gay, *op. cit.*, p. 53; Diehl, *Ravenne*, pp. 278-279.

atus est."[59] Here we find clear indication of what we guessed from the analogy of Africa and Italy, that by the middle of the seventh century Sicily was flooded with Greek-speaking refugees from the East.

The information from the *Liber pontificalis* is welcome, for the sources for the history of Sicily are meager after the *Registrum* of Pope Gregory fails us in 604. The Latin atmosphere of the island was certainly changing rapidly. About 648 St. Maximus Confessor, abbot of Chrysopolis near Chalcedon, visited Sicily and addressed a Greek letter "to the holy fathers, hegumens, monks and orthodox laity" resident there, which implies in its recipients a certain acquaintance with oriental theology.[60] Fortunately we have one sure example of the Byzantinization of a Sicilian abbey which at the end of the sixth century had been Latin and probably Benedictine. In 597 St. Peter's of Baias near Syracuse had as abbot Gregory's Roman friend Caesarius; by 681 it must have passed to the Greeks, since its abbot, Theophanes, was made patriarch of Antioch.[61]

How and when did such changes take place? Lancia di Brolo maintains that the island passed to the Greek rite and tongue during the six years (663-668) when Constans II made Syracuse his residence and the capital of the Byzantine Empire.[62] Certainly the presence of the imperial court in Sicily's metropolis would greatly stimulate such a transition. To uphold his contention Lancia di Brolo points out that during his stay Constans appointed as bishop of Syracuse a noted Greek hymnographer named George, who had studied at Constantinople.[63]

[59] *Liber Pont.*, I, 350, 359, 368, 371. The last of the Sicilian popes, Stephen III (768-772), went to Rome as a small boy in the pontificate of the Syrian Gregory III (731-741). *Ibid.*, p. 468.

[60] Migne, *Pat. Gr.*, vol. XCI, cols. 112 ff.; *cf.* vol. XC, col. 84.

[61] *Registrum*, Ep. VII, 36, *M. G. H., Epp.*, I, 485; *Liber Pont.*, I, 354. That Theophanes was not simply a Greek in a Latin abbey is indicated by the fact that when in 678 the emperor requested that monks be sent to a general council from the four "Byzantine" monasteries of Rome, Pope Agatho (another Sicilian) included Theophanes in the group. *Ibid.*, p. 355, n. 8; Mansi, XI, 200.

It is thought that Cosmos, the learned monk who was captured by Saracen raiders in the later seventh century and taken as a slave to Syria, where he became the tutor of St. John of Damascus, was a Sicilian. St. John's late tenth century biography merely speaks of Cosmos as "from Italy". Migne, *Pat. Gr.*, vol. XCIV, col. 441. Amari (I, 303) thinks he was Sicilian or Sardinian. An Arabic life of St. John composed in 1084 calls Cosmos a Calabrian; see G. Graf, "Das arabische Original der Vita des hl. Johannes von Damaskus", *Der Katholik*, XCIII[2] (1913), 173. However, the earliest extant biography, dating from the first half of the tenth century, has no mention of this Cosmos, but only of St. John's school-boy friend of the same name. M. Gordillo, *Damascenica: I, Vita Marciana*, in *Orientalia Christiana*, VIII[2] (1926), 64, 66.

[62] Lancia di Brolo, II, 21.

[63] *Ibid.*, II, 22, 324.

But the church of Syracuse, ruled in Gregory I's time by a Roman Benedictine, Maximianus,[64] had elected Greek-speaking bishops for twenty years at least before Constans appointed George to that see. In the first decade of the century Zosimus, the scion of a Greek family of Syracuse, entered the monastery of St. Lucy.[65] Thirty years later he succeeded Faustus as abbot—an indication that, whatever may have been the earlier situation at St. Lucy's, the dominant group of monks was then Greek. Under Pope Theodore (642-649), himself a Palestinian Melkite,[66] Zosimus became bishop of Syracuse, and gave to his cathedral a Greek-inscribed baptismal font which still exists.[67] After thirteen years (or between 655 and 662), he was succeeded by Elias, under whom the Greek biography of St. Zosimus was probably composed.[68] The appointment by Constans of a Greek-speaking bishop at Syracuse was therefore no novelty. The Byzantinization of Sicily was not the result of an emperor's residence there, but of a gradual process which was practically completed by his time.

III

There is evidence that in Rome by the year 700 the native Latin element was beginning to reassert itself, or at least to Latinize the descendants of the oriental immigrants.[69] Wherever the Levantine refugees of

[64] Formerly abbot of St. Andrew's on the Coelian; see note of the editors of the *Registrum*, *M. G. H., Epp.*, I, 15.

[65] The Greek original of Zosimus's *vita* is not extant. The Latin version in *Acta sanctorum*, March III, pp. 835-839, says he became an oblate at the age of seven, Faustus being abbot, that he was a simple monk for thirty years, and then ruled as abbot for forty years before being elected bishop under Theodore (642-649). According to this chronology, Faustus was abbot of St. Lucy's in 579 at the latest, and died in 602 at the earliest. But we know from Gregory's *Registrum* (Epp. I, 67, III, 3, VII, 36, *M. G. H., Epp.*, I, 87, 160, and 484) that an Abbot John ruled St. Lucy's from 591 to 597 at least. It is evident that an error has crept into the translation: the figure forty years includes Zosimus's whole residence at St. Lucy's, thirty years as oblate and monk, and ten years as abbot. No suspicion is cast on this biography by its reference to raiding Saracens as "Vandali", for the same expression is used in the authentic tenth century *vita* of St. Leo Luke of Corleone referring to the Sicilian Moslems. *Acta sanctorum*, March I, p. 98.

[66] *Liber Pont.*, p. 331.

[67] Strazzulla (*Museum epigraphicum*, pp. 206-207) disputes Lancia di Brolo (II, 34, n.) regarding this font.

[68] *Acta Sanct.*, pp. 835, 837.

[69] The later frescoes of Santa Maria Antiqua illustrate the revival of Latinism: "The steady decay of Greek form is accompanied by a change from Greek to Latin in the inscriptions. The inscriptions of Martin I (c. 650) are in Greek; those of John VII (705-07) are in Greek and Latin; and that of Paul I (757-67) is in Latin only". Avery, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

the seventh century found an essentially Latin population, their influence was merely temporary. On the contrary in Sicily (and probably in Lower Calabria) where, as we have seen, they found a vigorous substratum of Hellenes, the conjunction of these immigrants with the indigenous Greeks completely eliminated or Byzantinized the Latin group, which had been dominant for several centuries.

When did Latinism finally disappear from Sicily? The last trace of it is found in a document which has hitherto been regarded as a forgery, a letter of Pope Vitalian (657-672). It is one of a group of documents used to support the claims of Monte Cassino to lands in Sicily. In the years 1127-1130 Roger II of Sicily added all of Southern Italy to his domains. Monte Cassino, as the greatest monastic establishment of the kingdom, would naturally expect to receive considerable benefactions in Sicily (where it then owned no property) from its new sovereign. But Roger II proved reluctant; doubtless he was suspicious of Cassinese loyalty, in view of the abbey's tradition of friendship with both pope and German emperor. By a happy chance, legend told how Tertullus, the father of Placidus,[70] one of St. Benedict's favorite pupils, had given vast Sicilian estates to Monte Cassino, and how St. Placidus had gone to Sicily and there suffered martyrdom. The legend of these lands established a valuable precedent. Now there dwelt at Monte Cassino under Roger II the archforger of the Middle Ages, Peter the Deacon—a genius whose talents in our own day might have found a legitimate outlet in writing historical fiction. By 1130 Peter had already tried his hand at miscellaneous lives of saints. In a vain attempt to rouse the king's generosity, he produced a series of fabrications about St. Placidus and the Sicilian domains which for complexity and inventive ingenuity has no rival in the annals of medieval forgery.[71] Its chief components are two spurious *vitae* and a chronicle. But these are buttressed and supplemented by a most extraordinary variety of minor documents.

Two of these latter are of particular interest for us. The first is a letter purporting to have been written in 669 to the Benedictines of Monte Cassino, at that time residing in the Lateran, by monks who had survived a raid of Alexandrian Saracens which had destroyed the monastery of St. Placidus in Messina and ruined many of the possessions

[70] All that we know about the boy Placidus is found in Gregory I's *Dialogues*, II, c. 2, 5, and 7, Umberto Moricca, ed. (Rome, 1924), pp. 86-90.

[71] Erich Caspar, *Petrus Diaconus und die Monte Cassineser Fälschungen* (Berlin, 1909), pp. 47-72.

of Monte Cassino in Sicily. The other is the alleged reply of Pope Vitalian, sending some Cassinese to assist the distressed brethren in the work of reconstruction and urging co-operation in that pious task.[72]

Cardinal Baronius, the first historian to examine these documents critically, rejected them as forged.[73] His chief objection, aside from the exaggerated property claims of the first letter, arose from his own faulty chronology. On the basis of the errors in the *Liber pontificalis* he believed that Vitalian died in January, 669, and so could not have been responsible for the reply ascribed to him. Later scholars, although recognizing that Vitalian survived three years longer, have accepted Baronius's view. Mabillon, Di Giovanni, Jaffé, Ewald, and Caspar all condemn the letters.[74] In view of the frequent mention of St. Placidus, whose Sicilian martyrdom is pure fantasy,[75] and the outrageous assertion that "nonaginta et octo civitates et villae" of Monte Cassino had been destroyed, it would be a thankless task to defend the authenticity of the letter of the Sicilian monks to the Cassinese at the Lateran.

The case for the supposed epistle of Vitalian is not so black. In the eighteenth century the Bollandist Jacobus Bueus noticed that its references to landed property are much more modest than those in its companion and doubted Baronius's wisdom in holding both letters "ob mutuam connexionem aeque fictitias".[76] Caspar's discovery that another forgery of the same series—the donation of Sicilian estates to St. Benedict by Tertullus, the father of St. Placidus—is based on a genuine document, probably of the sixth century,[77] makes it likely that other authentic nuclei may be found in Peter's fabrications.

The text of the letter of Vitalian is as follows:

Vitalianus episcopus servus servorum Dei dilectis in Christo filiis sub patris Benedicti et Placidi dominio in Sicilia constitutis salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Ad hoc nos superna clementia in orbe terrarum praefecit rectores atque custodes, ut dispersa congregare, et congregata conservare, et destructa restituere summopere procuremus. Quapropter quia civitates, castra, monasteria, possessiones et villas beato Benedicto in Sicilia subditas

[72] C. Baronius, *Annales ecclesiastici*, ed. by A. Pagius (Lucca, 1742), XI, 571; Mansi, XI, 21; G. di Giovanni, *Codex Siciliae diplomaticus* (Palermo, 1743), pp. 396-398; Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, vol. LXXXVII, col. 1005.

[73] *Annales*, XI, 569-570.

[74] Jean Mabillon, *Annales ordinis S. Benedicti* (Lucca, 1739), I, 459; Di Giovanni, p. 374, note a; Jaffé-Ewald, no. 2102; Caspar, *Petrus Diaconus*, p. 68.

[75] Caspar, *Petrus Diaconus*, and H. Delehaye's note in the new Bollandist edition of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, November II, pars posterior (Brussels, 1931), p. 541.

[76] *Acta sanctorum*, October III (Antwerp, 1770), p. 101.

[77] E. Caspar, "Zur ältesten Geschichte von Monte Cassino", *Neues Archiv*, XXXIV (1908), 195-207.

paganorum incursionibus desolatas esse audivimus, supra modum dolemus, omnipotentique Deo super hoc gratias agimus, qui ideo temporaliter hic flagella [78] irrogat, ne in aeternum puniat. Unde vos carissimi filii, a fletu et moerere cessare monemus, et his nostris filiis, quos de Cassinensi congregatione ad monasteria restauranda, et civitates, castra, possessiones et villas recuperandas in Siciliam dirigere studuimus, ut specialibus dominis deservire curetis, ex parte beati Benedicti et nostra praecipientes, ut in restauratione monasterii et possessionum illos adjuvare studeatis, coeptumque laborem ad effectum perducere summopere procuretis. Nos enim et vos et civitates, castra, possessiones et villas, quas Tertullus patricius beato patri Benedicto dedit, defendere, adjuvare et manu tenere parati sumus. Omnipotens Deus sua vos gratia benedicat, atque a cunctis adversis eripiat. Valete.

The essential point to be noted is that if this letter were a pure fabrication, Peter the Deacon would have written it not in the name of Vitalian but in that of his successor, Pope Adeodatus. In 669 (or shortly thereafter) there was, in fact, a major Saracenic raid on Syracuse, recorded both by Islamic and by Christian historians.[79] The *Liber pontificalis,* however, explicitly places this attack in the pontificate of Adeodatus.[80] Nor is there anything in the *Historia Langobardorum,* which Peter copied verbatim for the account of the episode in his *Chronicle,*[81] to correct the defective dating of Vitalian's death found in the *Liber pontificalis.*[82] It is probable that Peter was also acquainted with the *Gesta episcoporum Neapolitanorum,* which likewise quotes the exact words of the *Historia Langobardorum* describing the raid, but which borrows from the *Liber pontificalis* the assertion that it occurred under Adeodatus.[83]

It will be seen, therefore, that Peter the Deacon had some very strong reason to believe that the *Liber pontificalis* was wrong in placing the Saracenic expedition under Adeodatus. In ascribing our letter to Pope Vitalian he was running a risk which a forger does not take lightly: he was flatly contradicting one of the most widely known his-

[78] "flagellari" in Mansi, XI, 22, and Migne, *Pat. Lat.,* vol. LXXXVII, col. 1006.

[79] Amari, I, 216-222. In forging the letter from the Sicilian monks to the Cassinese, Peter seems to have calculated the correct date from the twelfth indiction mentioned by the *Historia Langobardorum,* ed. by L. Bethmann and G. Waitz, *M. G. H., SS. Rer. Langob.,* p. 150, and by the *Liber Pont.,* p. 344, in connection with the murder of Constans II, the news of which precipitated the Arab incursion. The latest discussion of this crime is by P. Peeters, "Une vie grecque du pape S. Martin I", *Analecta Bollandiana,* LI (1933), 228-231. On Peter's skill in computing dates, see Caspar, *Petrus Diaconus,* p. 167, n. 6.

[80] P. 346. Peter used the *Liber Pont.* frequently; Caspar, *Petrus Diaconus,* pp. 62, 114.

[81] O. Caietanus, *Vitae sanctorum Siculorum* (Palermo, 1657), I, 181.

[82] *Hist. Langob.,* p. 150. This history was copied at Monte Cassino in the late eleventh century under the Abbot Desiderius. See Leo's *Chronicle,* ed. by W. Wattenbach, *M. G. H., SS.,* VII, 746.

[83] Ed. by G. Waitz in *M. G. H., SS. Rer. Langob.,* p. 419.

torical authorities of his time and was doing so without the support of any chronicle or document available to his contemporaries. Nor are we dealing with a mere *lapsus calami* on Peter's part, for his *Chronicle*, an integral portion of the Placidus forgeries, cleverly alludes to this papal letter.[84]

What was the source of information in which Peter felt such confidence? It appears to have been Vitalian's own letter, which our fabricator retouched in the interests of the Placidus legend and added to his corpus of forgeries. The present text of the epistle shows clearly that it is not in its original form. It contains two references to "monasteria" and "monasteria restauranda", both in questionable passages; but Peter betrays himself when his pen follows too closely the original, and Vitalian enjoins the Sicilian monks to aid "in restauratione monasterii". The use of the word *congregatio* is also significant: in the twelfth century it usually meant a group of cloisters dependent on some great abbey; in our letter it is used in the pre-Cluniac sense of a single *coenobium*.

To whom was the original letter sent? Since Caspar's rehabilitation of Tertullus's donation, it seems probable that in the seventh century Monte Cassino possessed latifundia and even daughter-houses in Sicily.[85] The authentic sources agree that in 669 the Saracens limited their devastations to Syracuse and its neighborhood. We know that some seventy years earlier there were Latin Benedictines thereabouts, for we have already noticed that Maximianus, bishop of Syracuse from *ca.* 590 to 594, had been abbot of Gregory's own foundation of St. Andrew on the Coelian in Rome, and that Caesarius, abbot of St. Peter's of Baias, near Syracuse, had formerly been a monk in Rome.[86] It seems highly probable, then, that Peter the Deacon's forgery rests upon an

[84] "Itaque dum Casinensi Congregationi tunc Laterani degenti relatum fuisset, qualiter Saraceni iam dicti Martyris Placidi Monasterium ruinae et monachos morti dedissent, Vitaliani Papae adminiculo fulti, cum ingenti apparatu mittentes in Siciliam, idem Monasterium restauraverunt". Caietanus, *loc. cit.*

[85] Baronius nods when he writes (*Annales ecclesiastici*, XI, 571) of these letters: "nobis parum arrident ob id potissimum, quod civitates plures in Sicilia hoc tempore possedisse monachi dicerentur: quando nec ipsa Romana Ecclesia vel unius oppiduli domina esset, ut ipsum possideret". In 685-686 the Byzantine emperor granted important fiscal exemptions to the papal estates in Sicily and Calabria (*Liber Pont.*, p. 366). Without other evidence the possession of these estates until 732 (see n. 88) cannot be used as proof of continued Latinity in Sicily. In 686-687 the rector of the papal properties was no longer a Roman, but a Sicilian named Constantine, deacon of the church of Syracuse and probably a Greek, *ibid.*, p. 369.

[86] Above, p. 14, n. 61, and p. 15, n. 64. The *Registrum* also mentions an Abbot Eusebius of Syracuse (Epp. II, 31, 35, *M. G. H., Epp.*, I, 127, 131) whose monastery is not named, and the abbey of St. Lucy in that city (Ep. VII, 36, *ibid.*, p. 484; also XII, 32, *ibid.*, II, 395).

authentic letter sent by Pope Vitalian, between 669 and his death in 672, to Benedictines in or near Syracuse. We are safe in assuming that if these monks were still clinging to St. Benedict's rule, they were not yet completely Byzantinized in tongue or culture.

Vitalian's letter is the last trace of Latinism to be discovered in Sicily until the coming of the Normans, four centuries later.[87] For at least two generations after 669 the island remained a part of the western patriarchate, but its interests and connections were almost entirely with the Byzantine East. In 732, because of Rome's stand against iconoclasm, Leo the Isaurian confiscated the papal estates in Sicily and Southern Italy.[88] There is no evidence that he transferred the bishoprics of those regions to the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople,[89] but inevitably, as the pope found new political support in the Frankish kings, the church of Magna Graecia drifted towards the New Rome.[90] By 787 the ecclesiastical shift was completed, for the Sicilian bishops called the Byzantine patriarch "universal".[91]

[87] Isidoro Carini, "Sopra un sugello siciliano inedito del Museo Britannico", *Nuove effemeride siciliane*, ser. 1, I (1869), 214-222, 268-276, ascribes a badly damaged seal with a Latin inscription to the Bishop George of Catania who appears in 679 (*cf.* Arthur West Haddan and William Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, Oxford, 1871, III, 131). But W. de Gray Birch, *Catalogue of Seals in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1898), vol. V, p. 37, no. 17,639, neglecting Carini's views, assigns it to Bishop Leo II of Catania, whom he wrongly dates *ca.* 778 rather than *ca.* 725; *cf.* B. Pace, "I barbari ed i bizantini in Sicilia", *Archivio storico siciliano*, XXXVI (1911), 22, n. 1. Probably the seal is hopelessly illegible. Certainly by *ca.* 786 Bishop Theodore of Catania had a Greek seal; *cf.* G. Libertini, "Miscellanea epigrafica", *Archivio storico per la Sicilia orientale*, XXVII (1931), 50.

J. Gay, "Notes sur l'hellenisme sicilien de l'occupation arabe à la conquête normande", *Byzantion*, I (1924), 223, quite properly rejects the theory of Amari, I (1833), 321-324, II (1858), 398-399, III (1868-1872), 204-206, 874-880, that a Latin element was present in Sicily when the Normans landed in 1060. Amari himself (II, 399) recognizes the weakness of his position. Similarly Paolo Orsi, in *Arch. Stor. per la Sic. Orient.*, XII (1915), 449, declares unproved the theory of N. Maccarrone, *La vita del latino in Sicilia fino all'età normanna* (Florence, 1915), that a part of the Sicilian peasantry spoke a vulgar Latin under Moslem rule. Rohlfs (pp. 85-86) is convinced by an examination of the modern Sicilian dialects that their roots lie not in the Latin brought to the island by the Romans but in the new Latinization of Sicily in Norman times.

[88] Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. by K. de Boor (Leipzig, 1883), I, 410.

[89] P. Lajolo, "Sul passagio delle chiese sicule sotto il dominio del patriarca bizantino", *Arch. Stor. per la Sic. Orient.*, XI (1914), 369.

[90] In the early ninth century Basil the Armenian remarks that the churches of Sicily and Calabria were united to Constantinople after "the pope of Old Rome fell under the power of the barbarians"; *cf.* George of Cyprus, *Descriptio orbis Romani*, ed. by H. Gelzer (Leipzig, 1890), p. 27.

[91] Mansi, XII, 1151, *cf.* pp. 983, 993, 1000; and Lancia di Brolo, II, 166-167. Shortly

In all else Sicily had become oriental more than a hundred years earlier. As in no other part of the West, the presence of a large indigenous Hellenic population in the island enabled the Byzantinism brought by refugees fleeing Persians, Monothelites, and Moslems to strike deep roots, to obliterate the Latin elements, and to produce a purely Greek culture, which flourished until Saracenic conquest crushed it in the late ninth century.

LYNN WHITE, JR.

Princeton University.

afterwards the Byzantine patriarch sent a letter directly to the Sicilian bishops (thus ignoring papal claims to jurisdiction in the island), and addressed them as "συλλειτουργοί", that is as using the liturgy of Constantinople. John Baptiste Pitra, *Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta* (Rome, 1868), II, 309.

THE OFFICE OF SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

THE treasury was chief among the administrative departments of the British government which were developing in the eighteenth century. An understanding of its growth and of its organization and inner machinery may contribute significantly to the historian's interpretation of political methods and governmental policies in that period. No political history of the time fails to record the activities of Walpole, Newcastle, Pitt, and others who held the office of first lord of the treasury; but the secretaries are seldom mentioned, although they frequently determined the course of events quite as decisively as those whose names are better known. The following article is intended to indicate the importance of the office of secretary to the treasury in the eighteenth century and to suggest the course of evolution which has made the office what it is today.

I

The origins of the office are obscure. It seems sufficiently clear, however, that the sixteenth century prototype of the eighteenth century secretary to the treasury was the scribe or confidential secretary employed by the treasurer of the exchequer. The transformation of the treasurer's personal secretary into a civil official was largely the result of the process of separating the treasury from the exchequer. The first step toward a separation of those two departments was probably taken by Burghley, Queen Elizabeth's lord high treasurer when he abandoned the custom of earlier treasurers and ceased to sit at the exchequer to give his orders in person.[1] Burghley's directions for the issue of funds were written in the hand of his secretary; and from the time of Queen Elizabeth the writing of such directions was the peculiar function of the secretary. This responsibility, upon which the routine of treasury and exchequer depended, established the secretaryship as a necessary office of the government, subject to, but distinct from, the office of treasurer.

During the seventeenth century the duties of the secretary expanded, and the office became more indispensable to the whole system of govern-

[1] F. S. Thomas, *Notes of Materials for the History of Public Departments* (London, 1846), p. 16.

ment. Of special significance in this development was the practice of placing the treasury in commission. James I introduced the practice in 1612 on the death of the Earl of Salisbury; and after the Restoration the later Stuarts frequently followed James's precedent. Since October 13, 1714, when the last lord high treasurer left office, the treasury has invariably been in commission. There were many duties of the office which a group of commissioners, unlike a single treasurer, could not actually perform themselves. Aside from the signing of certain documents, the main business of the treasury board was to decide policies and give orders, which the secretary carried out. Under such circumstances the secretary to the treasury became an important administrative official.

When the eighteenth century opened, a single individual occupied the office of secretary; but after 1711 two secretaries usually shared the responsibilities. Why the Earl of Oxford, when he became lord high treasurer in 1711, appointed his cousin, Thomas Harley, to serve as joint secretary with William Lowndes is not positively known.[2] Possibly the duties of secretary appeared too heavy for one person.[3] More likely, the earl wished one of his own confidants near him in the department, although he could not afford to dispense with the services of Lowndes, who was thoroughly familiar with treasury routine and was also reputed to be an able financier. Neither explanation is entirely convincing because, as a matter of fact, Thomas Harley was frequently away from London on confidential errands unconnected with the treasury.[4] Another more plausible reason for his appointment may be suggested. The fees of office were attractive; and the earl doubtless thought that Lowndes, who was acquiring a comfortable fortune, could afford to share the profits of the office with a member of the Harley family. Whatever the reasons which prompted Harley's appointment in 1711, from that date two secretaries usually shared the income, the privileges, and to some extent, at least, the duties of the office.[5] In the eighteenth

[2] "Mr Lowndes this day acquainted me that Thomas Harley Esq. was joined with him to attend my Lord Treasurer in the office of Secry of the Treary and that from this time the Office Fees on all Warrants to be signed . . . were to be divided as to the Secrys 2/3ds thereof, share & share alike between the said Mr Lowndes & the said Mr Harley" (Public Record Office, Treasury 38: 438, flyleaf).

[3] John Taylour, first of the principal clerks, had for some time been assisting Lowndes. Although the term secretary, as well as assistant secretary, has been used to apply to Taylour in referring to this early period, the author finds no contemporary evidence that Taylour was really secretary before Nov. 3, 1714.

[4] Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Manuscripts of the Duke of Portland*, V, 155, 184; W. R. Williams, *The Parliamentary History of Wales* (Brecknock, 1895), p. 174.

[5] A reference to the list of secretaries on pp. 44-45 will reveal occasional intervals when one secretary served alone. At such times, he received a double share of fees.

century, therefore, the office of secretary to the treasury was a joint secretaryship.

II

Biographical details, such as the family background, education, and experience of the secretaries, contribute to an understanding of the office which they held. Space, however, allows only a summary of the chief factors in the making of a secretary. As for family connection, very few sprang from the nobility; and scarcely one half belonged unquestionably to the landed gentry. The remainder represented trade or, in several instances, Ireland or the colonies. Public school or university education, while not requisite for appointment, was not uncommon. The Inns of Court gave many of the secretaries invaluable training in an office which dealt so extensively in legal matters as the treasury. Practical experience, either in one of the lower offices of the government or as private secretary to some important official, was required of all candidates, whether university graduates or not.[6] Such educational and practical experience naturally resulted in bringing only men of mature years into the office of secretary.[7]

Almost indispensable to those who aspired to the post of secretary to the treasury was a seat in the House of Commons. A large number of the secretaries were members of Parliament when they were appointed to the treasury; most of the others were seated as soon as possible after appointment.[8] Rarely did a secretary represent a county or a large town. The exceptional cases included Harley, who represented Radnorshire;

[6] William Lowndes and John Taylour at the beginning of the century, and Charles Lowndes and Thomas Bradshaw a generation later, rose from clerkships in the treasury to the position of secretary. Hardinge and Dyson had been clerks of the House of Commons; Edward Walpole and Henry Legge had served under the lord lieutenant of Ireland; four of the secretaries were promoted from subordinate positions in the office of one of the principal secretaries of state; and Rose, one of the most successful of the secretaries, had been a clerk in the record office of the exchequer, keeper of the records in the House of Lords, and secretary to the board of taxes. Horace Walpole was Henry Boyle's private secretary while the latter was chancellor of the exchequer; Henry Legge was Sir Robert Walpole's personal secretary; Martin, Legge's; Charles Jenkinson, Bute's; and George Rose advised Lord John Cavendish during Rockingham's second administration.

[7] Judging from available evidence, the youngest was thirty; and Scrope was known with reason as "old Scrope", for he was sixty on coming into the treasury, and he remained in office until his death at the age of ninety.

[8] Exceptions to the rule included John Taylour early in the century; William Mellish and Charles Lowndes, appointed in 1765; and Richard Burke, appointed in 1782. Edward Chamberlain, who was named in 1782 but never took office, was not a member of the House of Commons, and George Rose did not sit in Parliament during his first period as secretary, but came in soon after his second appointment. *Members of Parliament*. Gt. Brit., H. C., Parliamentary Papers, 1878, vol. LXII, pt. 2.

Jeffreys, Brecknockshire; and Robinson, Westmoreland; but all three were seated some time before they entered the treasury, and all had personal or family connections with the counties which they represented. The experience of the few secretaries who essayed contests in large boroughs did not encourage others to follow their example. In 1722 William Lowndes stood for election at Westminster but was defeated and took refuge in East Looe, one of the safe Cornish boroughs. Scrope represented Bristol in 1727; but the city turned against him when he supported Walpole on the excise bill, and he was obliged to find a retreat in Lyme Regis.[9] James West was more successful in his relations with St. Albans; nevertheless, his experiences led him to the conclusion that a secretary ought not to stand "for a populous borough, within twenty miles of London".[10]

More commonly the secretaries represented small corporations or pocket boroughs where contests could be avoided. The following Cornish boroughs supplied secretaries with seats in the House of Commons: Camelford, East Looe (on three separate occasions), Grampound, Launceston, Lostwithiel, Saltash (twice), and St. Mawes. Many secretaries were so fortunate as to be nominated by relatives or friends without the cost of a contest;[11] others depended for assistance upon the treasury.[12] In 1754, for example, Samuel Martin received £740 for election

[9] *Dictionary of National Biography*, Lowndes and Scrope; and the above list.

[10] British Museum, Additional MSS., 32921, f. 16, quoted by L. B. Namier, *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III* (London, 1929), I, 103. Nevertheless two open boroughs were secured by later secretaries to the treasury: Rochester by Grey Cooper, and Chichester by Thomas Steele. Wraxall stated that Steele's father was recorder of Chichester, and suggested that the Duke of Richmond was influential in securing Steele's appointment under Pitt (N. W. Wraxall, *Posthumous Memoirs of His Own Time*, London, 1836, I, 149). The duke's patronage very likely helped Steele to secure the election.

[11] Family influence probably secured Shaftesbury for Stephen Fox and Yarmouth for Horace and Edward Walpole. Sir James Lowther undoubtedly named Jenkinson for Cockermouth; the Duke of Northumberland used his influence at Launceston for George Rose; and Clive assisted Henry Strachey, who had been his secretary, to secure the election at Bishop's Castle. *Dict. Nat. Biog.*; *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1810, pt. I, p. 93; *Parliamentary Papers of John Robinson, 1774-1784*, William Thomas Laprade, ed. (London, 1922), p. 47; *The Diaries and Correspondence of the Right Hon. George Rose*, Leveson Vernon Harcourt, ed. (London, 1860), p. 8; and Namier, I, 129, 178, 179, 200, for facts about the boroughs.

[12] When and to what extent Government employed offices and funds to influence elections remains to be demonstrated. Mr. Namier has published an excellent study of the period of the elections of 1754 and 1761. Lacking a thorough study of earlier years one can only state, on the basis of available evidence, that the treasury did not use patronage for election purposes in the early eighteenth century to the extent that it did later. Early in the century the treasury did not insist upon making nominations to all revenue places it-

expenses at Camelford and the promise of a place in the alienation office for a man who could command a certain number of votes in the borough.[13] The Government was naturally influential where it had numerous places at its disposal. Three of the Cinque Ports—Seaford, New Romney, and Rye—were represented by secretaries in the eighteenth century; and Harwich, known as a treasury borough, returned a secretary to Parliament continuously from 1767 to 1782. This practice of securing seats in the House of Commons for secretaries indicates something of the importance of parliamentary membership to the treasury.

Even the laws by which Parliament limited and regulated its own membership favored the secretaries to the treasury. The requirement that ministers should resign their seats and seek re-election on accepting office under the crown did not affect the secretaries; and the act of 1742, which excluded clerks of the treasury from Parliament, specifically exempted the secretaries.[14] Like all members of the House, however, the secretaries were technically obliged to possess legal property qualification, an estate in land worth £300 a year in the case of a borough representative, and £600 in the case of a knight of a shire.[15] But as it was pos-

self; it left the naming of customs officers, for instance, to the commissioners of the customs. Godolphin evidently tried to keep the revenue officers out of politics, if his admonition to the customs commissioners to instruct their officers "to forbear meddling in any way in elections" is to be taken literally (*Calendar of Treasury Books*, 1702, p. 51). After the disfranchisement act of 1782 (22 George III, c. 41), the result of treasury influence became less predictable (*Parliamentary Papers of John Robinson*, p. 80).

[13] Namier, II, 417-418. That Martin did not depend entirely upon treasury assistance, the following extract from his own account book shows: "Pd Cha. Phillipps Esq^r of Camelford my share being 2 thirds of an allowance of 40£ per ann. or bounty agreed to be pd to Clode between us, while I served for Camelford, being the last years payment ended at Lady day 1768 by draught on Drummonds." The amount was £26.13.4. Add. MSS., 41359, p. 224, Apr. 11, 1770.

[14] 6 Anne, c. 41, §25. 15 George II, c. 22, §3, "Provided always, and it is hereby enacted and declared by the authority aforesaid, That nothing in this act shall extend, or be construed to extend, or relate to, or exclude . . . the secretaries of the treasury".

[15] For the necessary parliamentary qualification, Samuel Martin was ready to sacrifice his inheritance, as one learns from his own account. "I recollect perfectly", he wrote to his father in 1776, "that when you were deliberating thirty years agoe about accepting of Frederick Prince of Wales's offer to bring me into Parliament for a thousand pounds, and some hesitation occurred on acct of the expence of a fair & honest qualification of 300£ a year, I proposed that if you would enable me by a life annuity of that value issuing out of lands in England to receive conscientiously a seat in Parliament, I would relinquish to my brother George your eldest son by your second marriage my pretensions from priority of birth to expect the succession to your Estate at your death you agreed to my proposition and furnished me with 4000£ odd hundred pounds which were laid out in the purchase of such a qualification as I wanted" (The Martin Papers, Add. MSS., 41348, the folios of which were not yet numbered when used by the writer).

sible for a man to acquire a temporary or fictitious qualification, the secretaries did not necessarily hold property in land when they took their seats in Parliament.[16]

More important than any of the requirements mentioned above, in fact the *sine qua non* for appointment as secretary to the treasury, was a powerful patron. When Samuel Martin was trying to explain to his father the impossibility of making his brother secretary to the treasury, he summarized the qualification of a candidate for the office as follows: ". . . he must be in Parliament, he must be qualified with 300£ a year as well as knowledge, he must be thought capable of being usefull in an office that will not endure negligence or amusement, and what is no less essential than the rest I must have power to drag my brother after me into a lucrative employment & one of the most envied (so little are the alleys of it known) in the kingdom".[17] Apparently Martin felt that he lacked the necessary influence to serve as his brother's patron. Naturally the most influential patron in treasury affairs, as in fact in most governmental matters, was the first lord of the treasury, and next to him, the chancellor of the exchequer. Martin himself had been introduced to the treasury by Legge when the latter was chancellor of the exchequer. In four cases during the first half of the eighteenth century, the first lord filled the office of secretary with one of his own relations: Thomas Harley was a cousin of the Earl of Oxford, under whom he served; Charles Stanhope, a cousin of Sir James Stanhope, first lord of the treasury; Horace Walpole, a brother of Sir Robert; and Edward, Sir Robert's son.

In the latter half of the eighteenth century there is no instance of blood relationship between the first lords and the secretaries. The former in that period seem to have chosen their secretaries primarily for political considerations. Whately and Cooper, for example, were both political writers and attracted attention because of their political views and their ability as pamphleteers. John Robinson may have recommended himself to the Government by the training he had received as agent to Sir James Lowther, renowned as a borough manager.[18] Richard Burke was given his appointment to compensate his brother Edmund for not being named a member of the treasury board in 1782.[19]

[16] Edward and Annie G. Porritt, *Unreformed House of Commons* (Cambridge, 1903), I. 171 ff.

[17] Add. MSS., 41353.

[18] See Whately, Cooper, Robinson, in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

[19] John Morley, *Burke* (London, 1910), pp. 97, 138-139. Burke was not the first choice or even the second, however. Edward Chamberlain had been named, but was never called to the board because of his death on April 6. *Scots Magazine*, 1782, p. 221.

But the element of patronage was not lacking because these nominations were political. Throughout the century the secretaries owed their appointments to friendly patrons who, as party leaders, claimed the allegiance of those whom they placed in office.

III

The relation between the patrons and the secretaries often determined the latters' tenure of office. In other words, the connection between the first lord (or the chancellor of the exchequer) and the secretaries often resulted in the resignation of one or both of them when the ministers left office. The history of the tenure of the secretary's office is sufficiently significant to warrant a somewhat detailed account. Tenure is of interest for its connection with the development of parties and party politics, and in the study of the secretary's office it is peculiarly important because it caused definite changes in the office early in the nineteenth century.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century there was apparently no problem of tenure. There seems to have been a tradition of permanence in connection with the office, which persisted, as far as the first secretary was concerned, until 1758.[20] William Lowndes, John Scrope, Nicholas Hardinge—each one in succession remained in office as long as he lived, and each may be said to have occupied what might be called the permanent place in the office.[21] After the death of Hardinge the tradition was broken.

As far as the second secretary was concerned, there was an unwritten rule, seldom violated, that he should resign with his patron, to make room for a new appointee. Harley, who entered the treasury ten days after his cousin became lord high treasurer, left office when Oxford was succeeded by the Duke of Shrewsbury. Under Shrewsbury William Lowndes was the only secretary in the office; but soon after the Earl of Halifax became first lord, John Taylour was promoted to the position of secretary. Taylour's tenure was brief because Walpole came into office on October 11, 1715, and the following day his brother Horatio supplanted Taylour. The two Walpoles left the treasury together on April 15, 1717. On the latter date James Stanhope became first lord, and at

[20] This situation existed in spite of the fact that the secretaries came into possession of their office by the most informal procedure, simply being "called in" to take their places at the board.

[21] The word "permanent" in this connection was not in contemporary usage, but for convenience will be used in this article.

once his cousin was admitted as secretary. Charles Stanhope remained at the office under the Earl of Sunderland (Sunderland and Stanhope having merely exchanged offices) but was replaced by Horatio Walpole when Sir Robert became first lord again in April, 1721. Legge, who was the last of Walpole's appointees, remained at the treasury during the confusing political events that immediately followed Walpole's resignation in February, 1742, but vacated the office the following July. Henry Furnese held the position for a few months in 1742 and was then succeeded by Jeffreys, the protegé of the Pelham family.[22] Practical rather than purely political considerations probably dictated that Jeffreys should leave the treasury in 1746, as he was one of the least successful secretaries. He was followed by James West, a model by comparison, who remained in office during the treasurerships of Pelham and Newcastle, retired with the latter in 1756, returned again with Newcastle in July, 1757, and again resigned with his patron in 1762.

West's case, therefore, furnishes a very clear illustration of the relation between patronage and tenure. Martin's case, on the contrary, follows neither rules nor precedents. He certainly was not one of those who held office by permanent tenure; and yet he failed to follow his patron out of office. Perhaps his problem was more difficult than that of the others because he was originally recommended by Legge, the chancellor of the exchequer, and not by the first lord of the treasury. Martin came into the office in 1756 with the Duke of Devonshire's board; but for some unexplained reason he left the treasury in 1757, two months before the changes in the ministry. To his evident disappointment, he was not invited to take his old place after the reorganization in July, in spite of the fact that there had been a general agreement for the restitution of offices (or so Martin believed), and Legge was still chancellor of the exchequer.[23] Any agreement to the contrary notwithstanding, Newcastle took advantage of his prerogative as first lord and recalled James West. Hardinge's death in 1758 created an opening in the office which Newcastle filled, after some delay, by the appointment of Martin. Whether Martin then owed allegiance to Legge or to Newcastle was a matter of dispute.[24] When Legge was displaced in 1761, Martin kept his office. His letter to his father on that occasion is significant: "As to my own affairs, not thinking myself in the slightest

[22] Williams, p. 19; Namier, II, 489 ff.

[23] Add. MSS., 41356.

[24] *Ibid.*, 41355. Martin himself insisted that his obligation for his appointment was to Legge.

measure bound (nor being indeed permitted by him) to quit my offices, because Mr. Legge was displaced; you see from my continuance, that I stand upon my own legs."[25] If Martin thought of himself as the logical successor to Hardinge with a title to life tenure in the secretary's office, he must have been disappointed, for although he remained at the treasury while Bute was first lord, he vacated the office when Grenville came to be head of the treasury.

From 1763, the date of Martin's retirement, to 1782 no consistent policy in regard to tenure is discernible, although there was an increasing tendency for both secretaries to resign when there was a change in the cabinet. As Dyson, Bute's appointee, remained in office only a few months after Bute resigned, Grenville had the unusual opportunity of appointing both secretaries, and they resigned with him in 1765. His successor Rockingham, therefore, also appointed two secretaries. A detailed history of the changes in the period from 1765 to 1782 would be tedious and unnecessary. A mere comparison of the dates of the ministries with those of the secretaryships shows that while several secretaries survived the resignation of their superiors, the survival was for a short time only.

In 1782 both Grey Cooper, who had served several boards, and John Robinson, North's appointee, resigned when the North ministry went out of office, and established a precedent for the remainder of the century. Thereafter both secretaries left office when there was a change of ministry.

The reasons for abandoning permanent tenure are not so obvious as one might at first think. Patronage was no doubt an important element in bringing about the change, but not patronage in the sense of the spoils system—a system which permits not only the appointment, but also the dismissal, of civil officials, for partisan reasons. The spoils system was obviously making very little headway in the treasury department, for there was no question of dismissing clerks when there was a change of ministers.[26] Furthermore, if the secretaryship had been valued chiefly

[25] *Ibid.*, 41353, undated, but obviously referring to the dismissal of Legge, Mar. 21, 1761, when Barrington became chancellor of the exchequer. A memorandum in the Newcastle Papers, Jan. 18, 1761, seems to show that Martin was also in danger of being removed, but he apparently did not suspect it (*ibid.*, 32917, f. 464).

[26] A possible exception is found in the case of Lowndes, who was induced to give up a principal clerkship. Bradshaw was appointed over the heads of other clerks; otherwise the rule of seniority prevailed in making promotions (Treasury 29:34, pp. 206-207, 232; Treasury 1:419). When natural vacancies occurred, they were, of course, filled with friends of the ministers.

as a political pawn, a new minister would hardly have requested his predecessor's secretary to remain in office. It is significant that the secretaries themselves often took the initiative in resigning, thus proving allegiance to their retiring chief.[27] One must look to the changing character of the secretary's office, rather than to the growth of patronage in the modern sense, for an explanation of the change in tenure. As Lowell has said, "The keeping out of politics . . . and the permanence of tenure must, in the long run, go together".[28] But the secretaries were not refraining from politics; on the contrary, in the latter half of the eighteenth century, they were devoting more and more of their time to political activities.

IV

The functions of the secretary may be classified as personal (or private), administrative, and political. Inasmuch as that classification corresponds to the chronological development of the office, it forms a convenient basis for discussing the secretaries' work. The personal services were a survival from the time when the secretary was the personal servant of the treasurer. Even in the eighteenth century the secretaries were always at the command of the chief officers of the board—the first lord and the chancellor of the exchequer.[29] For instance, at seven-thirty one evening James West sent a message to the Duke of Newcastle explaining that since five o'clock in the morning he had been working on a certain matter of bank business which must be finished that evening, but concluded, "If My Lord Duke would have him attend him, he will come the moment he can dress himself".[30] West's colleague, Samuel Martin, apologized to the duke for sending instead of personally carry-

[27] On North's invitation, Bradshaw remained in office for a short time after Grafton resigned. When he finally left the treasury, he wrote to Grafton: "All your Grace's friends, as well as mine, know from me, that I leave the Treasury, because you are no longer at the head of it—I have a high esteem for Lord N—but I cannot transfer the warmth of attachment which is necessary for my situation, to whoever sits at that Board." (Grafton Papers, no. 616, Aug. 23, 1770. The writer is indebted to her Grace the Duchess of Grafton for permission to use these papers.) For reasons similar to those of Bradshaw, George Rose refused to continue in office after Pitt resigned (*Diaries and Correspondence of Rose*, p. 291). In contrast to this attitude is that of Samuel Martin, who wrote to Lord Barrington in 1762 "that he had never professed political attachments but served on the bare principles of doing his Duty and making himself useful" (Add. MSS., 41355). Even in 1762 that attitude was hardly acceptable to the politicians.

[28] A. Lawrence Lowell, *The Government of England* (New York, 1909), I, 147.

[29] This was true, although these officials had their own private secretaries. Newcastle had several.

[30] Add. MSS., 32888, Feb. 6, 1759.

ing a letter, with the following explanation: "I am obliged to stay at home in order to look over & consider the system of excise laws, this knowledge being necessary to prepare Mr. Legge as well as myself for the day of taxes." [31] Such personal attendance upon the first lord as was implied in these two notes must often have interfered with the departmental or administrative duties of the secretaries.

Naturally enough, perhaps, the administrative functions were the only ones which were officially recognized in the eighteenth century. For example, the investigating commission of 1786 described the work of the secretaries in broad outlines as follows: "The duty of the Joint Secretaries is to attend the Board, to receive their orders, see to the execution of the same, and generally to superintend the conduct of the business in every department of the Office." [32]

To list all the departmental functions of the secretaries, summarized in the commissioners' report, is manifestly impossible; a few illustrations must suffice to indicate the varied character of the work and the responsibility of the position. The duty of attending the board, which appears first in the commission's summary, was the least of the secretaries' duties; but the work which preceded and followed board meetings consumed a large part of their time. There was no permanent rule in regard to frequency of board meetings. In practice the number varied from one to six a week. The more experienced the board, the less often it was likely to meet. Walpole, Pelham, and Newcastle found it possible to carry on the work of the department with meetings only once a week, and long vacations in August and September. During critical periods more frequent sessions were required.

Before the board met, the secretaries prepared the business which was to be considered. Preparation involved the reading of innumerable letters, memorials, and petitions on which action was required, deciding which of these should be read to the board in full, and which should be briefly summarized. One of the secretaries outlined the business of the meeting, possibly, but not necessarily, in consultation with the first

[31] *Ibid.*, f. 196. Legge's enemies slightingly referred to the "clerk-like knowledge of finances" which he was able to acquire through the industry of "S.M." (*Gentleman's Magazine*, 1764, p. 554).

[32] *Accounts and Papers*, Gt. Brit., H. C., Parliamentary Papers, 1806, VII, 51. According to the same report, the business of the treasury board was "to consider and determine upon all matters relative to Your Majesty's Civil List, or other revenues; to give directions for the conduct of all Boards and persons entrusted with the receipt, management, or expenditure of the said revenues; to sign all warrants for the necessary payments thereout, and generally to superintend every branch of revenue belonging to Your Majesty or the Public" (*ibid.*).

lord,[33] and drafted resolutions which would be appropriate for the board to adopt.[34] Both secretaries were informed on the subjects to be discussed and possessed statistics and facts of all kinds which the board might require in reaching a decision.

In preparing the business for the board, the secretaries had an opportunity to exert a great influence upon treasury policies. The treasury lords were usually less well informed on the details of the problems with which they dealt than were their secretaries, whose business it was to become experts in matters of government finance and treasury administration. The secretaries had the advantage of handling the original correspondence and meeting in person many of the individuals whose cases came before the board. They had worked with actual figures of debts, taxes, and parliamentary estimates. For these reasons the members of the board were inclined to accept the recommendations of the secretaries. Their influence was especially great if the head of the treasury was more interested in politics than in financial problems. Even under Grenville, who was far from being uninterested in finance, the secretaries assumed important responsibilities. For instance, in the spring of 1765, Jenkinson, who was secretary at that time, wrote to Grenville: "I have settled a Plan for remitting the American Revenue. It concerns no body but the Receiver General of the Customs, & the Persons who have contracted to remit the Pay of the Troops . . . but as it relates to the Payment of Public Money it is proper that it sh[d] be done by a Minute of the Board, I send you the Draught of such a Minute". Quite certain that Grenville and the board would accept his plan, Jenkinson had already directed the commissioners of the customs to inform the collectors in America of what the treasury intended to do.[35]

Whenever the board met, one of the secretaries presented the business as he had prepared it, and the other secretary took the minutes. The board heard the matters outlined, listened to the papers that were read, and sometimes, in connection with the business of the day, interviewed outsiders. Usually the secretary in charge of the papers indicated briefly

[33] Samuel Martin to the Duke of Newcastle: "The business necessary to be dispatched tomorrow is . . ." (Add. MSS., 32887, f. 84).

[34] Thomas Bradshaw to Jenkinson: "The Treasury Board will meet on Tuesday next—I shall prepare such a Minute as you recommend, & which I think very proper upon reading the representation from the Comm[rs] of the Customs in America" (*ibid.*, 38205, f. 123). Further evidence of a secretary's preparing the resolutions is found in Grafton Papers, no. 641.

[35] Add. MSS., 38304, ff. 135-136. Plans of this nature were directly related to the efficiency of the military service in America, and of more importance than Jenkinson's note suggests.

on the back of each the corresponding order of the board. Such orders referred petitions or memorials to other offices, as that of the attorney general, the board of trade, or one of the principal secretaries of state, for further information; postponed a decision; granted the request, wholly or in part; or absolutely denied it. The board might take no action whatever in regard to a petition, in which case the endorsement, nil, succinctly told the story. The endorsements and the minutes contained the decisions of the board. The function of the secretaries was to see that these decisions were carried out.

The administrative work of the secretaries often involved great responsibility. If a board's orders were simple and direct, involving little more than routine action, a clerk might be depended upon to execute them; in many cases, however, the board's directions made it necessary for the secretaries to use their own judgment and discretion. For example, they were ordered to draft many important documents, such as commissions and instructions for newly appointed officers.[36]

In drafting commissions and instructions, the secretaries copied long established forms, but for new offices they were obliged to supplement the old forms with original clauses, defining the powers of the new officials and describing the methods of procedure which they should follow. More than superficial knowledge was needed in such cases. For instance, when called upon to frame commissions and instructions for officers who were to sell the land in recently acquired islands of the West Indies, the secretaries required information in regard to geographical, social, and economic conditions in the islands. The advice which they secured from the board of trade, inhabitants of the islands, merchants, and sea captains recently returned from the West Indies was often conflicting and lacking in essential details. In the end, according to their judgment, the secretaries were obliged to prepare the commissions, and what was more difficult, the instructions. Members of the treasury board usually ratified such drafts without question.[37]

Another important phase of the secretaries' work was drawing up terms of contracts. The first lord often handled the delicate negotiations with the merchants who contracted to supply the armies abroad with food, fuel, or funds, but the secretaries put the general agreements into

[36] Treasury 29:25, p. 169, for example.

[37] The minutes, at least, do not indicate that changes were made. See, for example, Treasury 29:45, p. 204. Add. MSS., 32905, f. 389, gives drafts of instructions drawn up by Martin and submitted to Newcastle. Individual members of the board, especially the first lord, might, of course, make suggestions while the secretaries were drafting the documents.

definite form.[38] In 1758 Newcastle apparently intended to leave full responsibility to Martin in regard to a contract for sending coals to Louisburg, for he wrote as follows: "I intend Colebrooke and Nesbet should contract for the garrison of Louisbourgh in the same manner (I don't say on the same terms) that Alderman Baker does for Nova Scotia . . . I depend upon you to see it done." [39]

Bills introduced into Parliament by the first lord of the treasury or the chancellor of the exchequer might be of more far-reaching importance than commissions or business contracts, but the framing of bills was also the work of the secretaries. The treasury lords might agree upon the principle of a bill, but one of the secretaries supplied the proper wording and frequently the essential administrative details.[40] In many cases the secretaries probably suggested legislation, although positive proof is lacking, for it is usually difficult to ascertain the real origin of a Government bill. This difficulty has long been apparent in discussions of the American stamp tax. Regardless of the source of the suggestion for the measure, however, the bill as approved by the treasury lords was drafted by the secretary, Thomas Whately.[41]

While the drafting of formal documents required much thought and care, ordinary correspondence took far more time. The volume of letters was tremendous, for the correspondents of the treasury included not only a vast number of revenue officials at home and in the colonies, but also representatives of all the other branches of the government—as there was no branch which did not have business with the treasury. Many of the letters written by the secretaries to revenue officials were in the nature of instructions, explaining or supplementing the formal documents. Unlike the commissions and instructions, however, the letters were seldom submitted to the board for formal approval. The signature of one of the secretaries at the end of a letter carried the authority of the treasury. Therefore, it was a grave responsibility which the secretary assumed when he wrote, dictated, or signed a letter.

One particular type of treasury letter, signed by the secretary, was the letter of direction, which was the final authority for making pay-

[38] Legal questions concerning the drafting of contracts and other papers were referred to the solicitor to the treasury.

[39] Add. MSS., 41354.

[40] Edward Hughes, *Studies in Administration and Finance, 1558-1825* (Manchester, 1934), pp. 234, 311, refers to the work of both Lowndes and Scrope in drafting bills.

[41] Add. MSS., 35910, ff. 310 ff., "Copy of Mr Secretary Whateley's Genl Plan for an American Bill Approved in Conference before all the Lords of the Treasury". In 1765 Jenkinson was framing a bill to billet soldiers in North America, probably the Quartering Act of that year (*ibid.*, 38304, f. 134).

ments from the exchequer. The letter indicated when payments were to be made on issues authorized by privy seals, treasury warrants, and the auditor's orders; the amount to be issued; and the funds from which the sums were to be drawn. The purpose of the letter was to prevent a shortage of cash in the exchequer at any time and to direct the order in which claims upon the exchequer should be honored.[42] Each week the treasury received from the exchequer a statement of cash, and the secretaries sent to the auditor of the receipt of the exchequer letters of direction for the issue of funds, limited in amount to the available cash.[43] Just how much responsibility was left to the secretaries in writing such letters is a question. When funds were plentiful the letter of direction was obviously merely a form; but when funds were scarce the letter of direction assumed real importance. At such times the head of the treasury probably gave the orders for such letters, but the board as a whole took no formal action on the matter.[44]

Another fiscal duty of the secretaries was that of accepting bills of exchange. When commanders abroad found it impossible to secure funds for the service of the government otherwise, they drew bills of exchange upon the treasury. The rules in regard to accepting such bills varied from time to time, and one of the secretaries' duties was to see that the regulations were enforced. If bills were received which were drawn contrary to regulations, the treasury board decided whether such bills should be accepted or not. Bills drawn according to regulations or ordered accepted by the treasury lords were marked as accepted by one of the secretaries and were then payable at the treasury or, according to an arrangement of 1765, at the Bank of England.[45]

[42] Add. MSS., 30219, pp. 27 ff. To prevent exceptions such as had been made under certain circumstances, the board issued the following order, Jan. 26, 1720: "My Lords direct that for the future no Sums of Money be issued at the Exchequer by virtue of any Privy Seals Wa^rr^ts or Orders out of Arrears of Money applicable to the Debts of the late King William or Queen Anne without a L^re^ signed by one of the Sec^rys^ of the Treasury directing such payment by Order of the Lords of the Treasury" (Treasury 29:24, pt. II, p. 29).

[43] From the various receivers of revenue the treasury learned how much each deposited in the exchequer. From the reports received from the exchequer and the receivers the clerks of accounts prepared the cash papers for the information of the secretaries and the board.

[44] The minutes of board meetings seldom mention letters of direction, but in 1726 the following exceptional note appeared: "Mr. Chancellor marks as many on the List of unsatisfyed Warrants as are to be paid out of the Cash of this Week and a Letter was signed for the same accordingly" (Treasury 29:25, p. 218). See Disposition Books for the letters of direction. Minute Books for the period when Godolphin was lord high treasurer and Henry Boyle was chancellor of the exchequer contain occasional references to the reading and approving of letters of direction.

[45] Treasury 29:37, pp. 155-156.

While issues of money were ordinarily made from the exchequer, or from one of the pay offices, directly to the recipient, the secretaries made certain confidential payments themselves.[46] Treasury warrants were made out to one of them, and he drew the money from the exchequer and distributed it according to the directions of the first lord. Much mystery had surrounded the two funds designated as secret service and special service, chiefly because the secretaries were accountable to the king and not to Parliament for the way in which they disposed of such money. John Scrope refused to take an oath to answer questions about his secret service accounts on the ground that "the Disposal of the Secret Service money by the Nature of it requires the utmost Secrecy and is accounted for to His Majesty only and therefore His Majesty could not permit him to disclose anything on that Subject".[47]

Many of the administrative functions thus far discussed were of a routine character, which could be performed by clerks under the supervision of the secretaries. But the supervision of a staff of clerks, increasing in number from twelve to thirty, not to mention messengers, doorkeepers, housekeepers, and other servants, was in itself a task and a responsibility. Early in the century the secretaries named the clerks, with the consent of the board;[48] but as the political value of patronage was more fully appreciated, the first lord tended to monopolize the power of appointment himself.[49] The work of the clerks was regulated by orders probably drawn up and recommended by the secretaries but adopted by the board and changed from time to time.[50] After 1759, and very likely before that time, one of the clerks read the papers at board meetings, although when business was divided between the secretaries,

[46] In some cases money was paid out by the receivers of the revenue.

[47] Add. MSS., 38337, f. 99; *Commons Journals*, XXIV, 299, slight variation, quoted in *Calendar of Treasury Books and Papers*, 1742-1745, p. xl. Many of those who received payments at the treasury were old servants or impecunious friends of the Government, or in some cases former officials, pensioners on the bounty of the crown. One typical case is illustrated by the following note which Jenkinson wrote to "Mr. S. Johnson" in 1765: "Having quitted the Office I held under His Majesty's Gov[t] I have no longer the Payment of the Annual Stipend which you receive from the Crown, & least you should not yet be informed to whom you are to apply: I think it proper to acquaint you, that M[r] Mellish I find is the Person who is intrusted with this Business" (Add. MSS., 38305, f. 19). For secret and special service accounts, see *Parliamentary Papers of John Robinson*, pp. 135 ff; Add. MSS., 41356; Namier, I, 215 ff; and *The Grenville Papers*, William James Smith, ed. (London, 1853), III, 143-144.

[48] Treasury 29:24, pt. II, p. 92; 29:25, p. 61; 29:27, p. 202. Minutes of a somewhat later date read "appointed by My Lords" (*ibid.*, 29:29, p. 109).

[49] *Ibid.*, 29:25, p. 173; "the appointment of clerks being the Duke of Newcastle's peculiar province" (Add. MSS., 41353).

[50] Treasury 29:22, pp. 29 ff.; 1:338, a proposed distribution; 29:33, p. 218; 29:35, pp. 53 ff.; Add. MSS., 30219.

the duty of reading the papers was regularly assigned to the elder secretary.[51] The clerks wrote many of the letters carrying out the orders of the board,[52] although the task of writing such letters was assigned to the junior secretary. Clerks handled the funds for bounties, a secretary writing the orders for payment in the name of the first lord[53] and auditing the accounts.[54] Many other departmental functions, too numerous to mention, were performed by the clerks, but the responsibility for their performance remained with the secretaries.

Closely connected with the personal obligations which the secretaries owed to the first lord of the treasury, or with the administrative work of the treasury office, just described, there was another set of duties which tended to become political in character. If the secretaries were members of the House of Commons, as most of them were, they could render valuable service to the treasury bench because of their expert knowledge of finance.[55] Scrope, for example, was said to be "perhaps the coolest, the most experienced, faithful, and sagacious friend the ministers had. He was greatly trusted in all matters of revenue, and seldom or never spoke but to facts, and when he was clear on his point."[56] The secretaries became skilled in the technique of parliamentary procedure and used their art to secure the passage of Government bills and to block legislation by the Opposition. Occasionally they introduced financial measures, and they often served on committees appointed to bring in bills. When the House divided, the secretaries were likely to be named as tellers.[57]

The position of teller was politically strategic, for in that position a secretary could readily count the friends and foes of Government. From his observations he drew up the division lists, which indicated the strength of Government and formed a record of individual votes. As the secretary to the treasury had at his disposal information in regard to

[51] Treasury 29:33, p. 218; Chatham Papers, G. D. 8:231. Possibly the board intended only that the clerk should read papers if the secretary were absent.

[52] Treasury 29:22, pp. 29 ff. In the absence of both secretaries one of the principal clerks signed letters (Letter Books).

[53] John Robinson to Pratt, "by the Order of Lord North", to pay bearer ten pounds (Treasury, 1:517).

[54] Sheridan reported to the board that he had examined Rowe's accounts of allowances to American sufferers (*ibid.*, 29:54, p. 257).

[55] Rockingham's administration in 1765 must have been handicapped by having neither secretary in Parliament. During his ministry in 1782, only one secretary was a member.

[56] *Parliamentary History*, VIII. 1196.

[57] Evidence for these generalizations may be found in the parliamentary debates.

all the members who had received favors from the Government (such as pensions, places, contracts, or assistance in elections, either for themselves or their friends), he was advantageously situated to whip in those members when an important vote was to be taken. In other words, the secretary to the treasury had unusual opportunities for managing the House of Commons. John Robinson, more than any of his predecessors, used these opportunities in a thoroughly systematic way.[58] He and Grey Cooper together, the one by his control of members, the other through his use of legislative tactics, made parliamentary management an art.

Of fundamental importance for the control of Parliament was the control of elections. The political game of election management was one in which the Government had long taken part, but it was not always considered a function of the secretary to the treasury. Because of their close association with the first lord, the secretaries to the treasury occasionally handled political correspondence, but the private secretaries of Pelham, Newcastle, and Bute relieved the treasury officers of a large share of the political business.[59] In later years, however, the secretaries to the treasury undertook the management of elections and accepted responsibility for those continuous processes by which parliamentary majorities were fostered.[60]

Patronage was the most effective means of controlling Parliament and elections, as political leaders gradually came to realize. Before the middle of the century the first lord of the treasury had gathered into his own hands the power of appointment, which at the beginning of the period had been divided among various subordinates.[61] With the negotiations and bargaining which preceded the making of an appointment

[58] Naturally the other friends of the Government worked with the secretary to whip in the members and to keep track of votes.

[59] A similar situation probably existed under Walpole, but without more evidence it is unsafe to hazard a generalization.

[60] *The Correspondence of King George the Third from 1760 to December, 1783*, Sir John Fortescue, ed. (London, 1928); *Parliamentary Papers of John Robinson;* Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Tenth Report*, X, App. VI, pp. 6 ff.

[61] Evidence is found in successive minute books and in the correspondence of the treasury, and has been especially noted in relations between the treasury board and the commissioners of the customs. Godolphin was accustomed to approve proposals for appointment made by the commissioners. In the early thirties there are many instances of nomination by the treasury. In 1742, under the Earl of Wilmington, there was a temporary reversion to the earlier method. Hughes, in his study of the salt office (*op. cit.*, p. 311), makes the following statement: "The sustained Treasury attack on the major revenue departments' control of local appointments dates at least from 1729." Another phase of the patronage problem was the attempt to prevent interference by the king.

the secretaries to the treasury were not necessarily concerned.[62] Jenkinson, for example, having dealt with patronage when he was Bute's private secretary and having become, as he expressed it, "thoroughly tired with that branch of the business", after he came to the treasury in 1763 was accustomed to refer requests for office to Charles Lloyd, Grenville's own secretary.[63] An arrangement, however, which separated patronage from the management of elections, and either one from the management of the House of Commons, fell short of perfect efficiency. John Robinson appreciated this fact and under Lord North successfully combined the three political functions which since his time have usually been connected with the office of secretary to the treasury: the management of the House of Commons, the management of elections, and the distribution of patronage.[64] He exercised the three functions very effectively to keep Lord North's Government in power. The result, as far as the secretary's office was concerned, was to exaggerate the importance of political functions without reducing the administrative responsibilities, so that the combination of personal, administrative, and political duties became increasingly burdensome.

V

A proper organization of the treasury would seem to have required a fair division between the two secretaries of the manifold functions demanded of them. Such a division was of course impossible early in the century when Harley and Walpole were frequently absent from the office.[65] As Lowndes was accustomed to full responsibility, it is not strange that he continued to bear more than half of the burdens of the joint secretaryship after Harley's appointment; and Lowndes's successors in the permanent position naturally took over the duties which he had performed.

After the abandonment of permanent tenure, the work of the office

[62] It is the writer's impression that as a rule, during the first half of the century, the secretaries to the treasury had very little to do with patronage. Hughes (*op. cit.*), however, discusses Scrope's control of the Scottish patronage under Walpole; and it is, of course, true that each head of the treasury had his own methods for handling the business.

[63] Add. MSS., 38305, f. 23. Jenkinson had had some trouble with Grenville over patronage, which may explain his desire, in general, to be rid of the business (*ibid.*, 38304, Aug. 22, 1764). He was not altogether consistent (*ibid.*, 38205, f. 12). Frequently the great men in office corresponded directly with each other in regard to patronage.

[64] From time to time Grey Cooper assisted with these functions, but they were primarily Robinson's responsibility.

[65] At that time one of the places in the secretaryship seems to have been in danger of degenerating into a sinecure, as did one of the places of solicitor to the treasury.

seems to have been divided more evenly between the two secretaries, who were now distinguished as elder and junior (or first and second), according to the order of their appointment. By custom certain of the principal duties of the office became associated with the first place, and others with the second. A new man entering the office stepped into the junior position and took over the functions of his predecessor in that place.[66] When Whately became secretary, he gave the following explanation to General Gage for answering a letter which had been addressed to Jenkinson: "Mr. Jenkinson to whom they were directed being now first Secretary to the Treasury on the Resignation of Mr. Dyson, it is become my Province to acknowledge the receipt of them".[67] A study of the treasury out-letters in the period when Jenkinson and Whately shared the office shows that they divided the work of correspondence, each one being responsible for the correspondence with certain departments or officials of the government. According to the usual division of administrative duties in the latter half of the eighteenth century, the elder secretary prepared the business for meetings of the board, and the junior secretary took the minutes and wrote the letters required by the orders of the board.[68] This was the general arrangement when Cooper and Robinson were in office,[69] although letters might, on occasion, be signed by either. Cooper, as elder secretary, had within his province the parliamentary business of the department—that is, the preparation of bills and material for their defense, and probably also the consideration of the estimates, which were prepared by other departments but approved at the treasury.[70] In the House of Commons, Cooper superin-

[66] The first clear indication that the board itself recognized such a distinction between the branches of the office is found in the following minute of May 29, 1762: "Mr. Dyson is called in and takes his place, by order of My Lords as One of the Secretaries of this Board, in the place of Mr. Martin, who succeeds in Mr. West's room" (Treasury 29:34, p. 295).

[67] *Ibid.*, 27:29, p. 9. It would be a mistake, however, to conclude that the junior secretary always handled such correspondence.

[68] G. D. 8:231, a paper of 1782 or 1783.

[69] Bradshaw to Grafton, Sept. 28, 1771, explaining how to avoid having a letter fall into the hands of Cooper, who would naturally have the stating of it at the board (Grafton Papers, no. 780).

[70] The term "parliamentary business" was used in 1759 in distributing work among the clerks; and the paper of 1782, referred to above, assigned such business to the elder secretary. Just what the treasury board intended to include under the head of parliamentary business is uncertain, but there was much work to be done in preparing for sessions of Parliament, and it is unnecessary to assume that the term implied political activity such as is understood by the expression management of the House of Commons. The distribution of other functions, described in the said paper, was approximately that actually

tended the introduction and passage of bills drafted at the treasury. Robinson, in addition to performing his share of the departmental work, was responsible for the political functions described above. Contrary to custom, both Cooper and Robinson received secret service money. Usually the elder secretary accounted for the secret service funds, and the junior, especially in the second half of the century, for the special service funds; but there were many exceptions to this custom.[71] In fact, during the eighteenth century there was never any hard and fast division of functions or responsibilities between the secretaries, for the office was in reality a joint secretaryship.

VI

For the unremitting attention and devotion which the majority of the secretaries gave to the first lord, to the treasury office, and to the work in the House of Commons, they were well rewarded. The fees of the office furnished a fund from which secretaries and clerks were both paid. Before 1782 two thirds of the income of this fund were divided between the two secretaries, or paid to one on occasions when a single secretary was in the office. The minimum annual income of each from the fee fund was about £2000, and the maximum, £5000.[72] In 1782 the treasury board fixed the annual salary to be paid from the fee fund at £3000—the average of the sums which had been received by the secretaries during several years of peace.[73] In addition to the return from the fee fund, each secretary was entitled to a share of the New Year's gifts, which added several hundred pounds to his income in the month of January. The rewards of the position were not limited to fees or

followed by Cooper and Robinson. In the eighteenth century the treasury was not accustomed to take official notice of the political functions of the secretaries. The paper of 1782 makes no reference to them, if the above interpretation of parliamentary business is correct; and a division of 1804, much more detailed than the earlier one, does not use the expression parliamentary business, but in reality divides it between the two secretaries by consigning to one the superintendence of revenue bills and to the other the superintendence of bills not concerned with revenue. In this latter division the treasury recognized patronage as a function of the secretaries (Thomas, p. 17). The present writer, therefore, believes that Mr. Laprade was under a misconception when he concluded that Robinson was the elder secretary, and that the "term 'elder' had, of course, no reference to seniority of appointment" (*Parliamentary Papers of John Robinson*, p. vi).

[71] During Grenville's administration Jenkinson received only one issue of £5000 for secret service and three of varying amounts for special service; and his colleague, none (Grafton Papers, no. 1046; *Grenville Papers*, III, 144).

[72] Treasury Fee Books, Public Record Office.

[73] Treasury 29:52, p. 518.

New Year's gifts, however.[74] Conveniently located near the source of patronage, the secretaries procured offices for their sons, their brothers, or more distant relatives, in the customs, the excise, or the exchequer. Many were able to provide fruitful sinecures for themselves, while still in office. On retiring from the treasury, they expected compensation in the form of a pension or some lucrative post under the Government. In fact, the office of secretary to the treasury was found to be not only a possible career in itself but also a convenient stepping stone to offices of more political prominence. Legge, Furnese, Jenkinson, Dyson, and Long became members of the treasury board within a short time of their leaving the secretaryship. Others filled positions which needed men with an aptitude for finance—treasurer of the navy, paymaster general of the forces, or member of the board of trade. Several found opportunities for extended political influence, but few filled offices which were essentially more important or more influential than that of secretary to the treasury.

Whether or not the income from the office, the opportunities for influence, the probabilities of pensions and places on retirement were commensurate with the burdens and demands of the office was a matter of opinion. The secretaries themselves often felt that the weight of the office was almost more than they could bear.[75] In 1782 one appointee, Edward Chamberlain, overwhelmed by a sense of his own insufficiency for the position, committed suicide.[76]

VII

By the nineteenth century, it was fully apparent that the joint secretaryship required reform. The functions of the secretaries were too numerous and too varied to be included in one office. The system of joint responsibility had obvious disadvantages, but as yet no satisfactory method of dividing the functions had been discovered. Especially objectionable was the combination of administrative and political duties; the frequent change of administrative heads was undesirable, yet, on

[74] The rewards were various and sometimes unexpected. In 1770 Bradshaw wrote to Grafton: "I have, tho out of office received a Turtle. Can it be of any use to your Grace?" Grafton Papers, no. 617.

[75] Martin wrote as follows: "I have been so much worried with unremitting application, that if I saw strong probability of the wars continuance (whence a great part of my slavery arises) for 2 years longer I would endeavour to procure a retreat for myself in some less active, tho it were a much less profitable, station" (Add. MSS., 41353). In 1768 Bradshaw wrote to Martin that he was "hurried and tired to death" (*ibid.*, 41354).

[76] *Scots Magazine*, 1782, p. 221.

the other hand, it was inconceivable that an official who possessed the political power then exercised by the secretary to the treasury should remain permanently in office, responsible neither directly nor indirectly to Parliament.

In 1804 the treasury board adopted the first of two important reforms. They provided for a more reasonable division of business between the secretaries by assigning the financial duties to one and the non-financial, including the distribution of patronage, to the other.[77] The following year a revolutionary change was introduced when the board appointed a permanent assistant secretary, who was ineligible for Parliament. After 1805, therefore, the arrangement was very similar to that which exists today: a permanent secretary, chief of the permanent staff, in charge of the office; a financial secretary, assisting the chancellor of the exchequer; and a patronage (or parliamentary secretary), assisting the first lord of the treasury in the management of the House of Commons.[78]

Dora Mae Clark.

Wilson College.

A List of Secretaries to the Treasury, 1695-1801 [79]

William Lowndes	April 24, 1695-January 20, 1723/4
Thomas Harley	June 11, 1711-July 30, 1714
John Taylour	November 3, 1714-October 12, 1715
Horatio Walpole	October 12, 1715-April 15, 1717
	April 3, 1721-June 24, 1730
Charles Stanhope	April 15, 1717-April 3,1721
John Scrope	January 21, 1723/4-April 21, 1752
Edward Walpole	June 24, 1730-June 1, 1739
Stephen Fox	June 1, 1739-April 30, 1741
Henry Bilson Legge	April 30, 1741-July 15, 1742
Henry Furnese	July 15, 1742-November 30, 1742
John Jeffreys	November 30, 1742-May 1, 1746
James West	May 1, 1746-November 18, 1756
	July 5, 1757-May 29, 1762
Nicholas Hardinge	April 22, 1752-April 9, 1758
Samuel Martin	November 18, 1756-April 30, 1757
	May 31, 1758-April 18, 1763
Jeremiah Dyson	May 29, 1762-August 24, 1763
Charles Jenkinson	April 18, 1763-July 15, 1765

[77] Thomas, p. 16.

[78] Corresponding to the division of functions between the two political secretaries was the arrangement by which the first lord devoted himself to the general tasks of prime minister, and the chancellor of the exchequer assumed responsibility for finance.

[79] The sources for the above list are the Minutes of the Treasury Board and the Treasury Fee Books. Contemporary printed sources are curiously inaccurate.

Thomas Whately	August 24, 1763-July 15, 1765
William Mellish	July 15, 1765-September 30, 1765
Charles Lowndes	July 15, 1765-August 18, 1767
Grey Cooper	September 30, 1765-March 29, 1782
Thomas Bradshaw	August 18, 1767-October 16, 1770
John Robinson	October 16, 1770-March 29, 1782
Henry Strachey	April 1, 1782-July 15, 1782
Richard Burke	April 6, 1782-July 15, 1782
	April 5, 1783-December 27, 1783
Thomas Orde	July 15, 1782-April 5, 1783
George Rose	July 15, 1782-April 5, 1783
	December 27, 1783-March 21, 1801
Richard Sheridan	April 5, 1783-December 27, 1783
Thomas Steele	December 27, 1783-February 26, 1791
Charles Long	February 26, 1791-March 21, 1801

INTELLECTUAL CROSSCURRENTS IN AMERICAN COLLEGES, 1825-1855

"Experience has shown", wrote the Reverend John M. Mason of New York, in the first decade of the nineteenth century, "that with the study or neglect of the Greek and Latin languages, sound learning flourishes or declines. It is now too late for ignorance, indolence, eccentricity, or infidelity to dispute what has been ratified by the seal of ages."[1] Mason's dictum reflects the prevailing cultured opinion of his day, which viewed the rigid classical and philosophical curriculum then in force in virtually every American college as proper and good for all purposes. To anyone casually familiar with the rapid changes of front in higher education in recent years such pontifical assurance is astonishing. It did not go unchallenged at the time but led to an extended dispute, centering, in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, upon the functions of colleges in the United States. The intrenched conservatives were sure of their ground. Unmoved by the experience of growing numbers of their countrymen in contact with the frontier, untouched by the rising tide of industrialism all about them, the champions of the existing intellectual order proclaimed their unwavering faith in the inherited tradition and its timeless values. Skeptics and critics questioned their premises and belittled their achievements; an occasional college dared to strike out in a new direction; and the sporadic experiments of the innovators provided material for spirited controversy as to the aims and methods of higher education suitable to a growing republic.

The number of colleges had increased, by the end of the third decade of the century, from the nine colonial colleges to more than half a hundred, and the rate of increase was steadily accelerating; in the West especially they were multiplying as rapidly, and often with as little financial backing, as boom townsites and wildcat banks. At the opening of the Civil War there were 182, the survivors of a struggle for existence in which the mortality rate had been very high.[2] Outwardly the Ameri-

[1] Jacob Van Vechten, *Memoirs of John M. Mason, D. D.* (New York, 1856), p. 239. Mason went on to say that whoever denied the superiority of the classics forfeited his claim to scholarship.

[2] Donald G. Tewksbury, *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities before the Civil War* (New York, 1932), pp. 2, 16, 28. This is a careful study. *The American Almanac and Repository of Useful Knowledge* for 1841 lists one hundred, but adds that

can college had changed considerably since the founding of Harvard, the faint replica of Emanuel College, Cambridge. Faculties were no longer independent guilds of scholars but instructors subordinated to self-perpetuating boards of trustees. The latter, generally recruited from the professional and business classes of the community, kept the teaching staff responsive to the wishes of its supporters. American colleges were losing the aristocratic character of their European prototypes; scattered about the countryside and competing for patronage, they had become accessible to wider strata of the population and to that extent were following the prevailing democratic trend. But while thus seemingly falling in step with the tempo of the times, they had not changed their fundamental character. The conformity to environment was external; in the content of the curriculum, in methods of teaching and of discipline, and in general objectives the average college did not differ radically from the little institution to which John Harvard had given his library two centuries earlier.

At that time Harvard's president, Henry Dunster, had summarized the course of study as follows: "Primus annus Rhetoricam docebit, secundus et tertius Dialecticam, quartus adiungat Philosophiam."[3] Within this framework he was trying to approximate, as nearly as possible in a new and wild country, the program of his alma mater, the English Cambridge. Freely translated and slightly expanded, this had come to mean in the early years of the nineteenth century a curriculum consisting normally of four chief divisions: the classics—the preponderant element—rhetoric and belles-lettres, mathematics and natural philosophy, metaphysics and ethics. Translation of Latin and Greek texts took up most of the time of the first three years, rhetoric and mathematics figured prominently in the freshman and sophomore years; natural philosophy, which included the rudiments of physics and chemistry, was usually a junior subject; and the senior year was largely given over to metaphysics and ethics, together with polemical lectures on the evidences of Christianity. In some institutions this stock matter was diversified by a little relish of geography or history of the chronological type, together with a bit of experimental chemistry and a suggestion of political science and economics. Occasionally there was an option of

some of these are really on a lower level. The figures in the *Seventh Census of the United States*, 1850, are higher: 173 in 1840 and 234 in 1850. The *Census* figures probably include many short-lived institutions.

[3] Louis Franklin Snow, *The College Curriculum in the United States* (n. p., 1907), p. 23.

French or Spanish. The standard curriculum was imposed upon the entire student body without choice of alternatives. Regardless of interest, talent, or professional plans, every candidate for the A. B. degree was required to carry this one program of activities to completion.[4] Under its influence the college student was likely to gain but little appreciation of the problems of a nation in which Henry Clay, rising on the "broadest shoulders of democracy", was proclaiming his American System, and Andrew Jackson, idol of the untutored self-made man, was about to enter the White House.

Classroom procedure showed a remarkable similarity and lack of originality, and the same was true of government and discipline. Laboratories and case methods, projects and problems, had not begun to complicate the teacher's life. On one day the instructor handed out a quantum of information, and on the next day the pupils handed it back. Lyman Beecher may have exaggerated the sad plight of the laboratory equipment at Yale, but his comment is worth repeating:

> As to apparatus, we had a great orrery. . . . It was made to revolve, but was all rusty; nobody ever started it. There was a four-foot telescope, all rusty; nobody ever looked through it. . . . There was an air-pump, so out of order that a mouse under the receiver would live as long as Methusaleh. There was a prism, and an elastic hoop to illustrate centrifugal force. We were taken up to see those dingy, dirty things, and that was all the apparatus the college had.[5]

Science in the colleges, until men like Benjamin Silliman and Thomas Cooper gave it reality, was a deadening routine. As for the social sciences, bits of economics, government, and psychology were likely to be parceled out by the president in his philosophy lectures. The one subject which demanded initiative on the part of the students was debating, a survival of the scholastic age.[6]

[4] The extent of the uniformity appears in a survey, made in 1829 by the *Quarterly Register* of the American Education Society (I, 228 ff.), of the admission requirements and course offerings of twenty-two colleges, ranging in location from Maine to Indiana and Tennessee. To be admitted as a freshman a boy was usually expected to have read a definite number of Latin classics, to have studied elementary Greek and perhaps read one of the Gospels, and to show some proficiency in arithmetic, grammar, and geography.

[5] *Autobiography* (New York, 1864), I, 39.

[6] Comments on courses and methods are found, for example, in Timothy Dwight, *Travels in New-England and New-York* (New Haven, 1821), I, 207 ff.; Francis Wayland, *Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System in the United States* (Boston, 1842), pp. 32 ff.; *Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White* (New York, 1905), I, 26; *Harvard Graduates Magazine*, XXI, 83, 84; E. M. Coulter, *College Life in the Old South* (New York, 1928), ch. VI; S. E. Morison, *The Founding of Harvard College* (Cambridge, 1935), vol. I, ch. IV.

College life resembled that in military barracks, and college government was a more or less benevolent parental despotism. Such a regime invited revolt. Everyone has heard of the cow in the chapel, the painting of the president's horse, the crockery battles in the commons, and the firecrackers in the classrooms. It is not necessary to draw on the theological doctrine of total human depravity for an explanation of these "extra-curricular activities". Here was undisciplined young America, often but a few years beyond the Indian-shooting stage, suddenly forced into a strait jacket of rules and expected to occupy itself with a routine of Latin and Greek translations, formal rhetoric, and cut and dried philosophy. Many an institution, as a result, led an existence bordering on chronic anarchy.

To express astonishment at the colleges' lack of adjustment to their environment would be to show ignorance of the social lag of institutions. The classical college was a vested interest and as such resisted change. Its traditions were carried from the older institutions to the newer. Harvard men had founded Yale; Yale men had helped to found Princeton; and the latter two colleges, the most conservative of the early ones, furnished the greatest number of presidents and probably professors to the newer schools of the West and South.[7] To cite but one instance of this: Joseph Caldwell was president of the University of North Carolina, except for one short interval, from 1797 to 1835. While there he supplanted the somewhat liberal curriculum which he found in force with the traditional course as he had known it at Princeton, his alma mater.[8]

Naturally the system did not escape criticism entirely. Before the opening of the nineteenth century new winds of doctrine, gentle and intermittent at first, had begun to stir the dead air of tradition. In some institutions the mechanical regime of supervision was humanized by sympathetic presidents. Timothy Dwight of Yale, Josiah Quincy of Harvard, Eliphalet Nott of Union, Horace Holley of Transylvania were enlightened leaders. In the hands of such men, too, the work of the senior year took on life and meaning until it became for many undergraduates the high spot of the college career. The loosely organized moral philosophy course, with its core of ethics and its smattering of logic and literary criticism, of political, economic, and psychological data, mostly derived from the old Aristotelian categories, offered limitless

[7] George P. Schmidt, *The Old Time College President* (New York, 1930), p. 96.

[8] Kemp P. Battle, *History of the University of North Carolina* (Raleigh, 1907), I, 95, 98.

opportunities to the ingenious teacher. He could turn it in many directions and make it serve as a vehicle for anything he wanted the seniors to know before turning them out into the world. A few examples will illustrate its possibilities. Timothy Dwight in his remarks on rhetoric and composition recommended Richardson as a novelist but warned against Fielding. The latter, he felt, ought not be read.[9] Samuel Stanhope Smith of Princeton introduced his hobby of anthropology and cited an instance of a New Jersey Negro who startled his neighbors by turning white.[10] Eliphalet Nott began with these opening remarks:

> Young Gentlemen. Your studies are intended to be such as are calculated immediately to improve the mind. . . . There are many, I have no doubt, in this class, as there are in all classes, who can't be persuaded to think. Them I could probably forward most by giving them longer lessons. But it has been my endeavor these twenty years, since I have had the care of youth, to make men rather than great scholars. I shall not give you long lessons, but shall lead you to exercise your own minds in much thought. Seniors should act for themselves. . . . It is easy to read, nothing is easier. The folly of most people is that they read too much. You should read but little, and turn that to the best account.[11]

From such a start he was led to discuss such varied topics as the causes of early death among Methodist ministers, the evils of drunkenness, the uses of New England singing societies, the best way to handle mobs, and the existence of ghosts—all this by way of comment on the subject matter in the text. Truly such a course, when conducted by a stimulating professor, made up for years of routine translation of the dead languages. Whether much objective knowledge or scientific accuracy resulted, is another question. But then facts were held secondary to mental discipline.

The late eighteenth century had witnessed several attempts to vary curricular procedure. William and Mary, largely at the instigation of Thomas Jefferson, had inaugurated far-reaching changes which involved freedom of selection and greater emphasis on history, government, and law.[12] In the words of Bishop Madison, its president:

> The Doors of ye University are open to all, nor is even a knowledge in ye ant. Languages a previous Requisite for Entrance. The Students have ye liberty of attending whom they please, and in what order they please, or all

[9] Lectures on Rhetoric and Composition, MS. notes by D. L. Daggett, 1807.

[10] *The Lectures . . . on . . . Moral and Political Philosophy* (Trenton, 1812), I, 46.

[11] Instructions delivered to the Senior Class in Union College, MS. notes by W. Soul and H. Baldwin, 1829.

[12] *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Paul Leicester Ford, ed. (New York, 1892), I, 69.

ye diffr. Lectures in a term if they think proper. The time of taking Degrees was formerly ye same as in Cambridge, but now depends upon ye Qualifications of ye Candidate.[13]

Another considerable innovation had been William Smith's program for the College of Philadelphia. In an idealized version of college education he announced his intention to reject some of the subjects commonly taught and to include new material. There was to be a five-year course, with proportionately less emphasis on Latin, and with the addition of modern languages, agriculture, chemistry, history, and political economy.[14] While the curriculum actually put in force fell short of this ideal, it did mark a new departure.

After a few years of comparative inaction, both as to founding colleges and reorganizing their activities, experimentation began anew after 1825. The most extensive and best known is Jefferson's project of the University of Virginia. Here his educational theories, first applied at William and Mary, were to be further developed. Jefferson's scheme called for eight schools which would comprehend the traditional subjects and also make room for the newer scientific interests and provide for training in several professions. A student, after selecting a school, was expected to complete its prescribed work. He might enroll in any course for which he considered himself fitted, the burden of proof to rest upon him. Designed originally as a graduate institution which would grant only advanced degrees, the university soon had to come down to the prevailing college level for lack of adequately prepared candidates for admission.[15] But though its constituency was not yet ready to support it in its entirety, the Virginia undertaking, like the University of Pennsylvania two generation before, marks a definite attempt to break the classical lockstep.

Similar attempts, on a smaller scale, were made elsewhere. At Union College the vigorous administration of Eliphalet Nott was entering the third decade of its long span of sixty-two years. Nott broke with precedent by establishing, in 1828, a parallel course in which modern languages might be substituted for Greek.[16] This was so glaring a departure from

[13] Letter to Ezra Stiles, 1780, in *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine*, XVI, 3.

[14] "A General Idea of the College of Mirania," app. II of *Discourses on Public Occasions in America* (London, 1762).

[15] Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia, 1819–1919* (New York, 1920), I, 322, 333.

[16] He had actually introduced the course earlier, but it was not reported to the regents until 1828. *Historical and Statistical Record of the University of New York* (Albany, 1885), p. 20.

tradition that he did not dare to grant the A. B. degree to students of the alternative course, but only a diploma certifying the completion of a definite amount of work. Even so, Nott was roundly denounced by other educators for his defiance of convention, and Union was attacked as the dumping ground of substandard boys from other institutions and of scholastic derelicts in general.[17] Nott denied all charges and retained the parallel course.[18] At Amherst a group of professors headed by Jacob Abbott, later famous as the author of the Rollo books, persuaded their colleagues to initiate a more flexible curriculum. This was in 1827. It was time, they felt, to heed the frequent complaints of parents that the college offered nothing modern and varied enough for the needs of the age. It seemed absurd, in a young, free, and improving country, "to cling so tenaciously to the prescriptive forms of other centuries". College doors should be open to those not destined for the learned professions. Accordingly they too suggested a parallel course with modern languages, English literature, history and political economy, and practical applications in science work. The trustees consented, and the course was launched.[19]

More revolutionary, if less influential, was the reorganization of the University of Vermont under James Marsh, commencing in 1826. Marsh was one of the growing body of American educators who were influenced by German thought and scholarship. Through Coleridge he had come to know Kant; he had read Heeren; he had undertaken the translation of some of Herder's writings; he was an idealist whose favorite author was Plato.[20] When he came to Vermont it was a run-down, financially encumbered college, with a handful of students and virtually no library or physical apparatus. Vigorous measures seemed in order. Marsh proceeded on the assumption that the way to revive the

[17] C. Van Santvoord, *Memoirs of Eliphalet Nott* (New York, 1876), p. 153.

[18] The Hobart three-year English course might also be mentioned here. President Jasper Adams of Hobart commended it in 1827 as meeting the needs of the farmers and mechanics of the neighborhood. At the same time he let it be known that it was distinctly secondary in value to the regular course, for only the latter could raise an aristocracy of talent. *Inaugural Discourse* (Geneva, 1827).

[19] "Two Reports of the Faculty of Amherst College to the Board of Trustees", in Snow, pp. 155 ff.; Claude Moore Fuess, *Amherst* (Boston, 1935), p. 99.

[20] Joseph Torrey, *The Remains of the Rev. James Marsh, D.D.* (Boston, 1843), pp. 76, 135. There appears to be some correlation between philosophical trends in the colleges and their attitude toward curricular innovation. At Vermont, and later at Michigan, idealistic philosophy and changes in courses and methods went hand in hand, while Princeton, hostile to such changes, was a leading exponent of the older Scottish philosophy of common sense. The parallel does not, however, hold throughout, and may have been a coincidence.

college was to give every prospective student something interesting and significant to do. He unfolded a practical plan of education which departed widely from the conventional. Four departments were to be erected, one of English literature, one of languages, one of mathematics and physics, one of political, moral, and intellectual philosophy. A student would work in one or at most two departments. No limit was placed on the number of courses or the time to be spent in finishing them. When the usual amount of work had been completed, as measured in hours or courses, the usual degree was to be awarded. The rigid four-class system fell; there were as many classes as there were subjects studied. Along with these changes Marsh tried to substitute for the customary dormitory discipline a more informal process of personal contacts and government by persuasion. Thus he hoped to meet the needs of a larger constituency, many of whom had been denied a higher education because they were not prepared for or interested in a classical and philosophical program.[21]

Though subjected to this increasing fire of criticism, the conservative position was not yet seriously shaken. Irritated, nevertheless, by the continuous sniping at their lines, the defenders of the old order felt it necessary to buttress their position and ward off further attacks. Critics must be answered and aims and objectives restated. The formulation of such an apology fell to the faculty of Yale, where the classical interests were perhaps most firmly intrenched. The largest college in the country and most representative of the nation at large,[22] its pronouncements on any subject were certain of wide and respectful attention. Accordingly President Jeremiah Day addressed himself to the task and called for a return to first principles. The immediate occasion was a request by the trustees in 1827 for a faculty opinion on the question of eliminating the "dead languages" as absolute requirements and of substituting modern languages as alternatives. The answer of the faculty came in a sweeping polemic designed to stop the mouths of the critics and to end, once and for all, the various attempts at mild or radical innovation.[23]

[21] *Inaugural Address* (Burlington, 1826); *System of Instruction . . . in the University of Vermont* (Burlington, 1831).

[22] The *Quarterly Register* of the American Education Society compiled attendance statistics from the several college catalogues. Its figures for the five largest colleges in 1829 are: Yale 359, Harvard 247, Union 227, Amherst 207, Dartmouth 137; for 1839: Yale 411, Union 286, Virginia 247, Princeton 237, Harvard 216. The distribution according to states shows Yale with the widest range and Princeton next.

[23] In Benjamin Sillimans *American Journal of Science*, XV, 297 ff.

The Yale Report is an able document. It has a salty flavor and makes short shrift of visionaries. Logical, coherent, and emphatic, it is a powerful plea for humanism and the liberal arts tradition as then conceived and anticipates many of the contentions of present-day advocates of the "genteel tradition". When analyzed, the aim set by the Yale professors for the liberal college is found to be not so far removed from that proposed by a recent critic for the modern university: intelligence, capable of being applied in any field whatsoever.[24] There is, however, this difference: subjects and courses accepted today without question as valid constituents of such an education were then outside the pale. The argument rests upon the assumptions that mental training can be transferred, and that it is secured by the existing tested curriculum better than by any other that might be substituted. Day contended at the outset that Yale was constantly, if slowly, improving and enriching its offerings. The faculty were not blindly walking the treadmill. Gradual change, however, was quite different from the extreme measures which many were then demanding. "From different quarters we have heard the suggestion, that our colleges must be new-modelled; that they are not adapted to the spirit and wants of the age; that they will soon be deserted, unless they are better accommodated to the business character of the nation". To this he replies that the object of the college is not superficial adjustment to passing desires, but intellectual culture, that is, the discipline and the furniture of the mind. Of the two, discipline is by far the more important. Professional and vocational training, while useful in a republic, have no place in a college. Therefore "we have, on our premises, no experimental farm or retail shop, no cotton or iron manufactory". The design is not to finish education, but to lay the groundwork by teaching how to learn. To train the mental faculties—the Report rings the changes on the phrase—only such subjects must be prescribed as fix the attention, train thought, arrange the treasures of memory, and guide the powers of genius. The Yale system has this end in view. The curriculum of classics, mathematics, and philosophy is carefully chosen and fully adequate. Free electives are therefore out of the question. A boy entering college at the age of fourteen cannot select wisely. "How is he to know whether he has a taste or capacity for a science before he has even entered upon its elementary truths?" Classroom methods of lecture, recitation, and disputation contribute to the general purpose, as do the dormitory rules governing the student's daily life. Lectures "give that light and spirit to the subject, which awaken the interest and ardor of

[24] Abraham Flexner, *Universities* (New York, 1930), p. 177.

the student". Recitations from a single text promote accuracy, for if the student were directed to many books, the diversity of statement would lead to confusion and inexact answers.[25] Day was undoubtedly consistent in demanding adherence to one text. An educational system based on authority can brook no disagreement among its authorities.

The second part of the Report is a bill of particulars justifying the course of instruction with its emphasis upon the ancient languages. Cultured men, said Professor Kingsley, who was mainly responsible for this part, speak a common language and share certain common subjects of knowledge. Mathematics, Latin, and Greek provide this stock in trade. Further, they form the taste and elevate the style, and are the best preparation for the learned professions. Modern languages should be studied through their classic roots. "To begin with modern languages in a course of education, is to reverse the order of nature". They are an accomplishment but should not be a requirement, and it is a mistake, for example, to read Voltaire in preference to Livy or Tacitus. As for belittling critics, their strictures do not apply to the college at New Haven. Yale graduates do know and appreciate the classics. Let there be no change, then, no truckling to popular whims, no compromise with mediocrity. "By persevering in its present course the college has much to expect and nothing to fear: but by deserting the highroad which it has so long travelled, and wandering in lanes and bypaths, it would trifle with its prosperity, and put at hazard the very means of its support and existence". The trustees accepted the Report, held the abolition of the classics requirement inexpedient, and suggested that in the future a still greater amount of Greek and Latin be required for admission.[26]

That the influence of the Yale Report was far-reaching goes without saying. It stiffened the backs of conservatives everywhere and provided them with ammunition for the fight against the Philistines. It bore out what had been so frequently said before. Day's predecessor, the great Timothy Dwight, had referred to Yale's classical program with approval and had contrasted it with the fashionable education of wealthy Bostonians who came down with chills and fever at the sight of a Latin author or a geometry text.[27] Among the most effective supporters of Day's views, one of his pupils, Frederick A. P. Barnard, may be singled out. Though destined to go over to the liberal camp many years later, when president of Columbia, Barnard remained long under the spell of his

[25] *American Journal of Science*, XV, 300, 304, 310, 313.

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 333, 337, 343.

[27] Dwight, *Travels*, I, 514.

teacher. A quarter century after the appearance of the Yale Report, the University of Alabama, where Barnard was a professor at the time, contemplated remodeling its plan of instruction along the lines of the University of Virginia. Barnard and a colleague, J. W. Pratt, were authorized to examine the proposal. Their suggestions to the faculty were in the spirit of the Day pronouncement:

> While the undersigned fully recognize the existence of a general desire for the improvement of the system of instruction which actually exists in this University . . . they by no means admit that there has yet appeared any evidence of a wish or design, on the part of the people, to subvert the system itself, and to erect upon its ruins, a fabric of so loose a construction, and so doubtful a character, as that of the University of Virginia.[28]

Alabama, they contended, should not try to give everybody the kind of instruction he might feel that he needed. Too many varied partial courses would lower standards and create a "sort of educational guerilla regiment". Colleges which had succumbed to such pressure were not flourishing. To bolster up their contentions the authors quoted numerous authorities. The Yale Report was cited, as well as opinions by Presidents Thornwell of the College of South Carolina, Swain of the University of North Carolina, Church of the University of Georgia, and Frelinghuysen of Rutgers, who all seemed to feel that the Virginia system was a mistake and that the established forms had better be retained.[29]

The Barnard statement might have added other names, for many voices had been raised during the preceding quarter century in approbation of the Yale position. In his inaugural address at Randolph-Macon College in 1834 Stephen Olin, prominent Methodist clergyman and educator, had rejected curricular experimentation as unwise for a new college.[30] Lyman Beecher had been more emphatic. In an address at Miami University in 1836 he had shown with a good deal of persuasive eloquence that the future of the West and of the nation as a whole depended upon the training of its college men in philosophy, logic, Greek and Latin, and the Bible.[31]

With such weight of authority mustered in its defense, the *status quo* was not likely to be fundamentally altered for some time to come. But

[28] *Report on a Proposition to modify the Plan of Instruction in the University of Alabama* (New York, 1855), p. 16. Barnard elaborated these views in another paper in the same year, *Improvements Practicable in American Colleges* (Hartford, 1856).

[29] *Ibid., passim.* Dr. J. H. Thornwell expressed his views in his *Letter to Governor Manning on Public Instruction in South Carolina* (Charleston, 1855).

[30] *The Works of Stephen Olin* (New York, 1852), II, 275.

[31] *A Plea for Colleges* (Cincinnati, 1836), *passim.*

while the persuasiveness of Day, Barnard, and Beecher confirmed the conservatives in their inherited pattern of thought, it did not silence the critics. Protests against the college treadmill grew louder and more widespread. In increasing numbers men came to agree with Andrew Dickson White that "gerund-grinding" was not education.[32] The proponents of change were not centered in one place or clustered about one leader. Critics with plans of their own ranged from New England to Tennessee and Michigan. Three of them will be discussed here as embodying the aims of the reformers. They are Philip Lindsley of the University of Nashville, Francis Wayland of Brown, and Henry Philip Tappan of the University of Michigan. The last two had been favorite pupils of Eliphalet Nott.

Lindsley was a native of New Jersey and a graduate of Princeton. He had taught at his alma mater and in 1825 had assumed the presidency of Cumberland College in Nashville, Tennessee, which styled itself, in the following year, the University of Nashville. Here he remained for twenty-five years. He found Tennessee a western state about to become southern. Its society, though it had scarcely emerged from the blustering, unlettered, frontier stage, was beginning to stratify. Under the steady pressure of soil contrasts, large-scale cotton production, and slavery, the plantation aristocracy was taking form, constantly recruited from the ranks of yeomen farmers and tradesmen and lording it, together with the professional classes, over poor whites and Negroes.[33] In this environment Lindsley labored to build up a rational system of education adjusted to the community. A series of addresses between 1825 and 1850 discloses the outlines of his plan as well as the difficulties in the way of its fulfillment. The general aim was widespread education for all citizens as a necessary prerequisite of a smoothly functioning democracy. It was an ideal which had been reiterated since the foundation of the Republic; it was soon to be given new emphasis by Horace Mann; Lindsley hoped to realize it in Tennessee. "A free government, like ours, cannot be maintained except by an enlightened and virtuous people". And again: "The farmer, the mechanic, the manufacturer, the merchant, the sailor, the soldier . . . must be educated".[34] The detailed plan called for six colleges, each with its separate land, building, refectory, and set of instructors. There were also to be shops,

[32] *Autobiography*, I, 27.

[33] Thomas Perkins Abernethy describes this evolution in *From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee* (Chapel Hill, 1932).

[34] *Inaugural Address* (Nashville, 1825), pp. 10, 16.

gardens, and an experimental farm. Both the state and individuals were to contribute funds. A complete university would thus result, offering liberal instruction and professional training and obviating the necessity of going east for a good education.[35] The university was to have twenty professorships and teach, in addition to the standard courses, international law, government, agriculture, statistics, commerce, manufacturing, fencing, riding, swimming, and gymnastics. Lindsley hoped to have the project under way within five years but cheerfully admitted it might be five hundred.[36] Classical studies would by no means be eliminated in the reorganization but, in remaining as only one of several optional courses, would cease to hold the center of the stage.

Needless to say, Lindsley's university did not fully materialize. Tennessee was unable, or unwilling, to supply the funds for such an elaborate program. The rising aristocracy was not easily won over to support the schemes of a northerner who denounced its duels and its entire gentleman's code as sham and hypocrisy.[37] There was also the opposition of other organizations which hoped to share in the distribution of public money. Repeatedly the head of the Nashville institution had to complain of the mushroom growth of small denominational colleges, contesting the prior claims of the university and supported by an obscurantist clergy. A licensed preacher himself, he aimed pointed shafts at the clerical profession: "If people choose to have inspired men for their spiritual guides, the less of human science with which they may chance to be encumbered, the better—at least, the more apparent and striking will be the evidences of their inspiration".[38] The church colleges promised "to work cheap; to finish off and graduate in doublequick time, and in the most approved style, all who may come to them".[39] The legal profession, too, seems to have crossed him. As for the lawyers and their "intricate and almost unlearnable" science of common law, "they will abound and flourish just in proportion to the general ignorance and degradation of the mass of the people". Neither preachers nor lawyers "would be the worse for a thorough scientific education", the only safeguard against priestcraft and legal chicanery.[40]

Lindsley, out in Tennessee, reached a limited audience. Far more

[35] *Commencement Address,* 1826 (Nashville, 1833), pp. 29, 30.

[36] Quoted in Halsey, "A Sketch of the Life and Educational Labors of Philip Lindsley", in Barnard, *American Journal of Education,* Sept. 1859.

[37] *Baccalaureate Address* (Nashville, 1827).

[38] *Cause of the Farmers,* 1829 (Nashville, 1832), p. 32.

[39] *Speech about Colleges* (Nashville, 1848), p. 14.

[40] *Cause of the Farmers,* pp. 31, 33.

influential because more widely known were the reforms of President Francis Wayland of Brown. A contemporary of Lindsley—his administration lasted from 1827 to 1855—he was perhaps the foremost critic of tradition during these years. Wayland brought a freshness and originality to Brown. Independent in judgment, he refused to accept institutions whose sole merit was that of antiquity. When he found the textbooks in his subject not to his liking, he wrote his own texts. When he reached the conclusion that the entire collegiate system of the United States was wrong, he persuaded the trustees of Brown to let him substitute his own system there. On the lecture platform and in published works he outlined his views and elaborated his proposals for improvement. The particular problem confronting him was a declining enrollment and dwindling funds, and in his quest for a solution he was led into an extended investigation of the practices and achievements of American colleges in general.[41]

The colleges, said Wayland, had lost their momentum, for they had been unwilling to keep pace with the rapid changes in the social structure. Modeled after the Oxford and Cambridge of the seventeenth century, they had really changed very little and were still far too prone to venerate antiquity and ignore present reality. Precedent and authority had obscured contemporary needs. "God intended us for progress, and we counteract his design when we deify antiquity, and bow down and worship an opinion, not because it is either wise or true, but simply because it is ancient." It was not surprising, therefore, that the public was withholding both students and funds, for the colleges were not giving the public what it wanted. "What", he asked, "could Virgil and Horace and Homer and Demosthenes, with a little mathematics and natural philosophy, do towards developing the untold resources of this continent?" [42] In an address delivered at Union College, four years later, he expressed the ideal of a democratic system of education in a passage reminiscent of Lindsley:

> When our systems of education shall look with as kindly an eye on the mechanic as the lawyer, on the manufacturer and merchant as the minister; when every artisan shall be transformed from an unthinking laborer into a practical philosopher; and when the benign principles of Christianity shall

[41] Wayland's views are expressed in the following treatises: *Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System in the United States* (Boston, 1842); *Report to the Corporation of Brown University* (1850); *The Education Demanded by the People of the U. States* (Union College address, 1854); *Lecture before the American Institute of Instruction* (1854).

[42] *Report to the Corporation*, p. 12.

imbue the whole mass of our people with the spirit of universal love,—then, and not till then, shall we illustrate to the nations the blessings of republican and Christian institutions.[43]

Wayland found more to criticize. It was true, he admitted, that the colleges had from time to time added subjects of instruction—half-hearted concessions to the progress of knowledge—but they had never removed any. The result was an indigestible mass of subject matter, which led inevitably to slovénliness of performance. The student acquired the habit of "going rapidly over the text-book with less and less thought", and there was a tendency to cultivate "the passive power of reception instead of the active power of originality". The student "thus knows a little of everything, but knows nothing well".[44] This superficiality was carried into the life of the nation, and one looked in vain for classical or mathematical scholars among college graduates. The colleges, then, as Wayland analyzed them, were training only the few and were not training them well. Several remedies were indicated, of which the best would be the substitution of free electives for the old system of compulsion. This was his recommendation to the trustees. Every student, he urged, should henceforth choose his courses freely, but under faculty guidance. When he had completed a definite number and passed a final examination, he was to receive the A.B. degree. Any combination of courses was to be allowed, and the student need not spend four years in college if he was able to finish in shorter time. The existing curriculum was to be enriched by instruction in the modern languages, the sciences, history and political economy, agriculture, law, and the science of teaching. The classics would no longer be the *sine qua non* but, placed on a parity with all other subjects, would stand or fall on their own merits.[45] The trustees adopted Wayland's recommendations, ordered instruction in the new subjects, and established the Ph.B. degree for students who had taken no Latin or Greek. The new degree, like the A.B., might be earned in less than four years. Students who completed the usual four-year classical course were to receive the A.M. degree, which would thus be earned and not honorary as heretofore. When these changes became effective, Brown differed more widely from the norm than any other northern college.

Quite different from Wayland's ideal was that of Henry Philip Tappan. On the eve of his appointment as president of the University

[43] *The Education Demanded by the People*, p. 29.

[44] *Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System*, p. 83.

[45] *Report to the Corporation*, pp. 51 ff.

of Michigan Tappan expressed his educational philosophy in a treatise entitled *University Education*. Appearing the year after Wayland's Report, it offers an interesting parallel. The aim of Tappan's university was not social and civic training but intellectual excellence of a kind which, he felt, America did not yet appreciate. "In our country", he maintained, "we have no Universities".[46] They were not to be created, however, by popularizing the colleges, as Wayland had suggested, with a wide range of subjects acceptable to all but by enriching the opportunities and intensifying the work for the few who might qualify. Tappan would not broaden the base but raise a higher superstructure. Like Jeremiah Day in the Yale Report he hoped to train the intellect, but he did not propose to limit himself to the classics and mathematics as means to that end; nor was he satisfied with the passive receptivity implicit in Day's scheme.

> A University course, presumes a preparatory tutorial course, by which the students have acquired elementary knowledge, and formed habits of study and investigation, to an extent sufficient to enable them to hear the lectures of professors with advantage, to consult libraries with facility and profit, and to carry on for themselves researches in the different departments of literature and science.[47]

Tappan felt that Wayland was mistaken in dangling college before the eyes of the commercial and agricultural classes, for he believed that in America men did not need college to achieve material success. "The commercial spirit of our country, and the many avenues of wealth which are opened before enterprise, create a distaste for study deeply inimical to education". Cheapening college, therefore, with a window dressing of short courses and practical subjects, would not help. There might be a temporary influx of students, but only until the novelty wore off. "The idea of fitting our colleges to the temper of the multitude does not . . . promise great results." The only proper incentive was "the satisfaction and distinction of a thorough and lofty education".[48] With this aristocratic ideal Tappan set out for Michigan, in the heart of the democratic West.

Before considering the outcome of his plans it is tempting to speculate on the relative proportions of native contribution and European carryover in this chapter of the progress of civilization in America. The facts thus far reviewed, though insufficient for a positive assertion, would seem to warrant some tentative conclusions. One thing stands out: the

[46] *University Education* (New York, 1851), p. 50.
[47] *Ibid.*, p. 47.
[48] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

demand for reform was not inspired by the frontier. There was no West speaking with united voice and forcing progress upon a reluctant and Europeanized East. The colleges in all sections presented external changes. Much local pride went into their building. But, though consciously different from the aristocratic universities of Europe and hailed as the people's colleges where knowledge was diffused among the masses,[49] they retained, as has been shown, most of the form and substance of their seventeenth century prototypes. With a few exceptions, western and southern institutions willingly accepted the forms and traditions which their Yale and Princeton trained presidents brought with them. Allegheny College imbedded a chip of Plymouth Rock and some mortar from Virgil's tomb in its cornerstone, and the first commencement of this little center of learning on the edge of the settled area included the customary Latin and Hebrew orations.[50] Not long after the patrons of Blount College in eastern Tennessee had attended to the more immediate business of exterminating the Indians, the first graduate was examined in "Virgil, Rhetoric, Horace, Logic, Geography, Greek Testament, Lucian, Mathematics, Ethics, and Natural Philosophy".[51] It was stated in the *Western Review* of Cincinnati in 1820:

> Should the time ever come when Latin and Greek should be banished from our Universities, and the study of Cicero and Demosthenes, of Homer and Virgil should be considered as unnecessary for the formation of a scholar, we should regard mankind as fast sinking into absolute barbarism, and the gloom of mental darkness as likely to increase until it should become universal.[52]

There was apparently nothing in the writer's western experience to challenge his inherited views. In his *Plea for Colleges,* mentioned above, Lyman Beecher insisted that the mental discipline instilled by the classics could alone breed respect for law and prevent the "spirit of innovation and a leveling radicalism" from destroying that idyllic culture, based on liberty under law, which was flowering in Ohio.[53] Self-discipline was also urged by Elihu Baldwin of Wabash College, who considered the West "the sublimest dwelling-place for earth's population on which the sun ever shone". The best way to achieve self-discipline, so he told the undergraduates, and to prepare for the service which they owed

[49] Tewksbury, pp. 4 ff.

[50] George R. Crooks, *The Life of Bishop Matthew Simpson* (New York, 1890), p. 126.

[51] Edward T. Sanford, *Blount College and the University of Tennessee* (Knoxville, 1894), p. 22.

[52] Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines, 1865-1880* (Iowa City, 1928), p. 146.

[53] Beecher, *Plea for Colleges,* p. 19.

their native land, was to be diligent in the study of Latin, mathematics, and philosophy.[54]

Western educators, as such, did not demand the reorientation of American colleges in the name of democracy. These demands came from individuals, east, west, and south. They were grounded, to be sure, on the obvious needs of a changing society. But the actual plans and programs which the leaders introduced did not grow from the soil. They were not primarily the product of their authors' American experience, but were largely derived from their familiarity with European conditions and in some cases tied up with European thought. They held up the mirror of the old world to the institutions of the new. It will be remembered that Jefferson was willing, with one or two exceptions, to import the entire faculty for his university from Europe, reserving only the chair of moral philosophy for an American, who could be relied upon to dispense no "European gospel" in the important field of personal and social ethics.[55] Abbott and his colleagues at Amherst had compared European institutions and methods by way of preparation for their reform. Marsh was steeped in the philosophy of Kant and of Cousin, and, like Abbott, had compared the college system in the United States with the university systems of the old world. Lindsley in Tennessee was no more provincial than his contemporaries in New England. Though not a slavish imitator, he obviously drew on his knowledge of European conditions in planning for the University of Nashville. Even Wayland, an independent thinker, did not ignore the old culture. His comments on European conditions as he found them in 1840 are critical, it is true; and his observations in England, Scotland, and France only served to strengthen his pride in his American, democratic, and Puritan heritage.[56] His views were perhaps more directly influenced by a visit to the University of Virginia and by the example of his teacher, Eliphalet Nott. Yet at the same time he exchanged opinions with British educators, whose critical comments on American methods he held of value, and his writings show familiarity with the European and especially the English origin of the American college system.[57]

The most forthright exponent of European thought and practice was

[54] E. F. Hatfield, *Patient Continuance in Well-Doing: a Memoir of Elihu W. Baldwin* (New York, 1843), pp. 322, 395.

[55] John S. Patton, *Jefferson, Cabell, and the University of Virginia* (New York, 1906), p. 76.

[56] Francis and H. L. Wayland, *A Memoir of the Life and Labors of Francis Wayland* (New York, 1867), vol. II, ch. I.

[57] The *Report to the Corporation* of 1850 sketches the European background of American colleges and contains lengthy extracts from the *Edinburgh Review* and from the report of a royal commission dealing with the universities of Scotland, p. 35.

Tappan, who suggested the erection of a university in New York City, at a cost of $450,000, frankly patterned after those of Europe and especially Germany.[58] When fortune carried him to Michigan, he tried to build one there modeled upon Prussian originals. This was a mistake. The turbulent democracy of Michigan, torn by local jealousies and sectarian strife, did not look with favor upon such a state university, nor did it appreciate the dignified and imperious president who liked to call himself chancellor and who flaunted an eastern accent. His motives were misunderstood, his ideals ridiculed, and his efforts to raise scholastic standards suspected as vaguely un-American. He has been hobnobbing with aristocrats, cried the editor of the Detroit *Free Press* in alarm, he is Prussianizing free Americans. "Ann Arbor is not Berlin". And the Lansing *Journal* jeered: "Of all the imitations of English aristocracy, German mysticism, Prussian imperiousness, and Parisian nonsensities, he is altogether the most un-Americanized—the most completely foreignized specimen of an abnormal Yankee, we have ever seen".[59] Coming in 1854, at the height of the Know-Nothing movement, these editorial outbursts poured oil on the flames of nationalism and materially weakened Tappan's position. In spite of the growing opposition, he held his views before the Michigan electorate for eleven years before he was forced out.

Tappan's university experiment was premature. Elsewhere, too, the experiments of the reformers were failing to fulfill the hopes of their supporters. The net results of three decades of critical discussion of the historic curriculum, as seen by the middle of the fifties, were astonishingly meager. Adjustment to change was slow. Most of the pedagogues who dispensed the intellectual fare were not to be stampeded into novel diets. With a few notable exceptions, the old regime continued but little modified. The greatest deviation from the norm was still to be found in the University of Virginia. There, during the fifties, the eight projected academic and two professional schools were all functioning, with complete freedom of choice among them, and each was introduced in the catalogue with an intelligent statement of purpose. The enrollment during this time rose above six hundred, a figure exceeded only by Yale.[60] It is likely that such numbers were not due entirely to the

[58] *University Education*, p. 90.

[59] Quoted in Charles M. Perry, *Henry Philip Tappan* (Ann Arbor, 1933), pp. 200, 202.

[60] The catalogue for 1857, for instance, gives a total of 633. This includes undergraduate and professional students. *The American Almanac* for 1860 has the following figures of undergraduates: Yale 502, North Carolina 450, Virginia 417, Harvard 409, Union 326.

liberal character of the school but in part, at least, to the rising tide of southern nationalism. In contrast to Virginia the other experimenting colleges did not fare so well. Lindsley at Nashville was kept from his goal by lack of funds, popular indifference, and the competition of denominational colleges. The parallel course at Union was retained but did not draw many students. After three years' trial the Amherst plan succumbed to the hostility of the majority of the faculty, who pointed out that the new classes were being poorly conducted, and that there was not the same prestige attaching to the secondary course with its diploma as to the standard A.B. degree.[61] Similar forces led to the undoing of Wayland's elaborate reforms at Brown. Originally approved by the Rhode Island legislature and by labor organizations and newspapers generally, they had been subjected to severe criticism on the part of conservative college leaders and periodicals. When the plan was put in operation, it was discovered that the new courses were not being taught in the new spirit but were continuing the old cheerless grind of mechanical recitations. In time the enrollment fell off. Students expressed a feeling of inferiority because Brown degrees were being discounted elsewhere, and President Sears, Wayland's successor, finally reported, in 1856: "We are now literally receiving the refuse of other colleges".[62] What had been begun as an attempt to raise standards had apparently resulted in their decline. The upshot was an almost complete reversal of policy and a return to the old forms.

The country's leading institutions were averse to rapid change and undigested reform. At Harvard, where Josiah Quincy's suggestion to make the classics optional after the freshman year had led to a partial use of electives,[63] this freedom was again restricted under later presidents. Yale continued to chart its course according to the prescriptions of the Day Report.[64] Other colleges ventured to try limited electives, or scientific and modern language courses, always subordinated, however, to the classical. Specific terms, such as chemistry, physics, botany, began to supplant the older designations of natural philosophy and natural history; French and German appeared in the catalogues with increasing frequency; political economy and the social sciences in general were emerging from the catchall course in moral philosophy; and history was trying to free itself from the tutelage of classical or English literature.

[61] Fuess, p. 99.

[62] Walter C. Bronson, *The History of Brown University* (Providence, 1914), p. 323.

[63] Josiah Quincy, *Remarks on . . . the Present State of the Latin Department* (Cambridge, 1841).

[64] Snow, p. 142.

But much of this added material was decorative and not to be regarded as of equal importance with Latin, Greek, mathematics, and philosophy. At the University of North Carolina the proportion of time devoted to ancient and modern languages for each of the four undergraduate years is indicated by the following figures, each representing the number of lectures or class meetings per semester: Latin, 83, 65, 57, 30; Greek, 83, 74, 54, 38; French, none for freshmen, then 18, 47, 18.[65] At Columbia, as late as 1862, one professor taught German, ancient history, Greek and Roman antiquities, and ancient geography. In the same year Dr. Torrey was permitted to give a series of lectures in botany "at such hours as will not interfere with the regular studies of the Undergraduates".[66]

When John Maclean announced the principles and policies which were to guide him at Princeton, in 1854, he was probably expressing the prevailing opinions of responsible educators. "We shall not aim at innovation", said Maclean. "No chimerical experiments in education have ever had the least countenance here". It was not his intention to make Princeton College a collection of separate schools or to permit the students to decide for themselves which branches to study and which to neglect. Aiming, as always, at mental discipline, Princeton would adhere to the standard course and require all its students to take it. To modern languages, political economy, and the sciences "sufficient attention will be given to impart a definite idea of the matters of which they treat".[67] Rules of conduct, too, were to be scrupulously observed; Princeton would remain conservative and safe.

The old guard was still in control. Three decades of agitation had apparently availed little. Up to the Civil War the traditional college, with its prescribed curriculum and its rules of behavior minutely governing the student's life, remained much as it had been at the opening of the century. Naturally there were grades of achievement and individual differences. By multiplying professional departments and attracting superior instructors, Harvard and Yale were slowly raising themselves above the general level. Though courses might bear the same labels in the catalogues, breadth of scope and depth of achievement varied with the equipment of the college and the ability of its faculty. With a library of 123,000 volumes,[68] and men like Aggasiz and Gray,

[65] *Catalogue of . . . the University of North Carolina*, 1851-1852.

[66] *Annual Catalogue*, for 1862–1863, p. 99.

[67] John Maclean, *History of the College of New Jersey* (Philadelphia, 1877), II, 421, 427 ff.

[68] *The American Alamanac*, 1860, p. 204.

Sparks and Peirce to enrich its courses, Harvard offered opportunities not to be matched by the newly founded southern or western institution where the president, a couple of tutors, a shelf of books, and a handful of students constituted the college. Between the two extremes there were all gradations. Each new establishment in the interior reproduced conditions which the older ones were outgrowing. Yet the differences between the old and the new were of degree and not primarily of aim and method. A full-fledged university, serving the needs of a changing social order, with freedom of choice and possibilities of research, had not been realized. Neither Wayland's nor Tappan's ideals had found much support. Barnard's work at Columbia and White's at Cornell were still in the future. The day of Eliot and Gilman had not dawned.

GEORGE P. SCHMIDT.

New Jersey College for Women.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

Greek Tyranny

In the history of modern Europe there are moments when monarchy, instead of being an institution within which democracy could not develop, actually hastened, by the suppression of many petty nobles for example, the growth of the democratic process. It is perhaps a fact that in earlier societies, before the various political possibilities were known, monarchy, or one-man rule, was often a necessary step on the road to democracy. This was true of ancient Greece, although the point is generally missed.[1]

The Greeks regarded as a tyrant anyone who seized the reins of government illegally. It is the fashion today to look upon the institution of tyranny as something peculiarly Greek, a curious intermediate step between aristocracy and democracy, and one that delayed the inevitable realization of political equality, though contributing in a measure to it. Perhaps the best statement of present-day opinion is in the *Cambridge Ancient History,* where H. T. Wade-Gery says that the tyrants' "reigns are cardinal in the development of Greece, leading up to the emergence of the *Demos,* and forming an interregnum between the mediaeval aristocracies and the classical democracies and oligarchies".[2] "Interregnum" is an unfortunate word. I believe that tyranny, or one-man rule, was a natural development in Greek constitutional history.

The Greeks, who burst upon the Balkan peninsula and western Asia Minor in the eleventh century before Christ, destroyed a brilliant prehistoric civilization and were for some two centuries engulfed in a dark age. The Dorians had come with a tribal organization headed by kings, who at an early period were forced by the nobles to surrender most, if not all, of their power. Rarely has any class in history so dominated the political scene as the Greek aristocracy. Powerful barons who owned most of the land and wealth of the country, they destroyed not simply the power of the king, but nipped in the bud the youthful assemblies

[1] The purpose of this paper is to offer a statement of the significance of Greek tyranny, not a history of it. The reader who wishes a history of the many Greek tyrannies will find that the *Cambridge Ancient History,* and its bibliographies, will set him on the track.

[2] III, 548-549. Wade-Gery does not develop this idea but enters upon a history of tyrannies.

which had grown up about his person. No great aristocrats are known to us by name, for aristocracy brooked no insubordination within its ranks. So long as society remained simple, pre-eminently agrarian, and isolated, so long as wealth was measured in land and the cavalry constituted the army, aristocracy had the semblance of permanency. What tension existed was largely relieved by colonization. These expeditions, sent across the seas, drained the home city of ambitious nobles and the troublesome poor and at the same time were the cause, wholly unanticipated, of new ideas reaching the metropolis. Aristocracy was not fitted to withstand for long new ideas, especially if they were of a disturbing sort.

Tyrants flourished in the seventh and sixth centuries before Christ. These were centuries of great change, new influences, restlessness, and extremes of wealth and poverty. Writers on the subject generally try to find some common denominator to explain the rise of tyranny. The economic explanation is the usual one. Since tyrannies appear among the towns on the trade routes from Asia Minor to the Corinthian Isthmus and the West, many feel that the origin of tyranny is to be found in the rise of industry, even though this would not explain the institution in agrarian states. P. N. Ure, in his *Origin of Tyranny*, is even more specific. He says:

> The seventh and sixth century Greek tyrants were the first men in their various cities to realize the political possibilities of the new conditions created by the introduction of the new coinage, and . . . to a large extent they owed their position as tyrants to a financial or commercial supremacy which they had already established before they attained to supreme political power in their several states.[3]

There is not enough evidence to support so narrow a thesis, and indeed the whole book, published in 1922, reflects the disposition of the day to explain everything on economic grounds.

Various influences, dating from a remote period, had cast the form of Greek political life as the city-state—a small exclusive organization, membership in which depended on birth—and through all the vicissitudes of war, revolution, and peaceful development the city-state remained, until Macedon felled it at a blow. When we consider, then, that the Mediterranean was dotted with many small independent states, it would be rash to assume that any one factor, such as the introduction of coinage, was responsible for thoroughgoing political change. We are nearer the truth if we assume that different forces in different places, in

[3] Ure, *The Origin of Tyranny* (Cambridge, 1922), p. 2.

fact several forces in the same place, were often at work. The introduction of coinage into an agrarian state was destined, of course, to have profound social consequences, for a new form of wealth, independent of land, was created. The concomitant rapid rise of industry in many states served further to widen the gap between rich and poor, and had it not been for two other factors in the equation it is perhaps possible that aristocracy, by admitting the wealthy to its ranks, might have temporarily saved itself on a broad front through oligarchy. One of these factors was of recent origin, the other was deeply rooted in the past. By the seventh century the old aristocratic cavalry had ceased to be the sole defense of the state, for by its side had grown up a citizen army, the hoplites. These middle-class foot soldiers naturally demanded a voice in the government. Far more serious, on the Corinthian Isthmus in particular, was the racial question. We find in many states a sharp division between the descendants of the Dorian conquerors and of the pre-Dorians. There was bitter feeling between the two racial groups, with the non-Dorians often in a pitifully depressed condition. In Sicily, on the other hand, where tyranny was late in appearing, there were still other forces at work. The threat of Carthage, the interest of Greece proper in the island, the rivalry of the individual cities helped to make it politically expedient to submit to tyrants. Thus it is impossible to discover any one reason for the rise of the tyrants, except the rather vague, though very effective, force known as unrest. A change in the form of wealth and its production, together with a change in the military arm of the state, and often coupled with fear or racial hatred, produced a dissatisfaction which rendered political change inevitable. It was logical, therefore, in the days before the democratic pattern had been worked out, for the masses to rally about an individual. Indeed, this was the most effective way in which aristocracy could be crushed and at the same time a forward step taken, unconsciously though it might be at the moment, on the road to democracy.

This destruction of aristocracy and preparation for democracy, then, are the glory and significance of tyranny. The tyrants understood well the source and basis of their power and generally ruled in the interests of the people, though some were "tyrannical". Occasionally a family governed for a century, and on the whole it was a period of great prosperity and of an intelligent patronage of the arts. Some states, it is true, never turned to tyranny, but to oligarchy or federation instead, while others, fearing tyranny, sought to solve their problems by the safer method of appointing a prominent citizen to act, for a limited period, as

lawgiver. Athens, for example, which had previously been threatened by tyranny, appealed first to Draco and then to the great Solon. Solon, who was one of the few really forward-looking Greeks before Alexander, nevertheless failed to eradicate the chief cause of dissatisfaction at Athens, and Pisistratus, supported by the peasants from the hills of Attica, eventually became tyrant.

It should be added that democracy did not inevitably follow tyranny, but the exceptions were due to special causes. Democracies on the Isthmus, for example, were short lived, for Sparta preferred that the states within her Peloponnesian League should be oligarchic, and in Asia Minor Persia, as she advanced to the seaboard, considered tyranny a surer method of controlling the Greeks. Yet by the close of the sixth century, tyranny, having raised the masses, had as a result yielded in many places to democracy. Nevertheless the old issue, indeed the only persistent issue in ancient Greece, of the Few against the Many remained.

C. A. Robinson, jr.

Brown University.

New Light on the Lincoln-Blair-Frémont "Bargain" of 1864

The circumstances surrounding John C. Frémont's withdrawal from the presidential campaign of 1864 and Montgomery Blair's dismissal from the Lincoln Cabinet on the following day have long puzzled historians. They have been the subject of varying interpretations, some of them diametrically opposed, and there is good reason to believe that the entire truth is not known even yet. From time to time new materials have been discovered which shed a little additional light upon the problem, and it is with regard to the most recent of these that this note is primarily concerned.

Not until 1880 did anything like an authoritative account of the Lincoln-Blair-Frémont affair appear. At that time, however, the Detroit *Post and Tribune* published its *Zachariah Chandler: an Outline Sketch of His Life and Public Services,* containing what purported to be an "inside" account of the matter. The author of the chapters dealing with Chandler's political life was George W. Partridge, "who was for some years a private secretary to Chandler, and who had access to Chandler's private papers after his death".[1] There was good reason, therefore, to accept Partridge's explanation.

[1] William Ernest Smith, *The Francis Preston Blair Family in Politics* (New York, 1933), II, 284, n.

The Partridge version of the episode was that Chandler conceived and undertook to negotiate among the various Republican factions an agreement which would culminate in party solidarity at the polls. The first part of the plan, as it was finally worked out, was to secure the support of Wade and Davis for Lincoln in return for the dismissal of Montgomery Blair. This was arranged without difficulty enough to occasion comment. The second part was to use Lincoln's concession with regard to Blair as a lever for removing Frémont from the campaign. A protracted interview with the Frémont leaders in New York resulted in the striking of a bargain. Frémont was to accept the decapitation of Blair as sufficient reward for his withdrawing from the canvass. Returning to Washington, Chandler rushed to the White House to report "the successful result of his labors". In due course of time the bargain was fulfilled to the letter by both parties. Thus stated Partridge.[2]

James Ford Rhodes accepted and gave the first widespread currency to the Partridge account. It was quite natural that he should do so since the bargain story had stood unchallenged for two decades when virtually every other episode of the war years had been the subject of acrimonious debate. Furthermore, Nicolay and Hay, far from denying it, had neatly side-stepped the whole matter. Doubtless Rhodes was influenced in his acceptance by the view of the *Nation,* which took occasion to state baldly that "the coincidence between his [Blair's] withdrawal and Fremont's, and the great importance of the latter event in the impending campaign, certainly lent plausibility to the current rumor that the one thing hinged upon the other".[3] Therefore Rhodes minced no words but committed himself positively. "The bargain", he asserted, "was faithfully carried out."[4]

In 1922 Nathaniel Wright Stephenson challenged the entire Partridge version. "Whatever may be said of the physical facts of this narrative," said Stephenson, "its mental facts, its tone and atmosphere are historical fiction." That Stephenson himself did not accept even the "physical facts" is indicated by his reference to the story as a "legend" and by his

[2] Detroit *Post and Tribune, Zachariah Chandler,* pp. 273-277.

[3] *Nation,* July 4, 1889, p. 3. That this actually was the then "current rumor" and that Blair himself may have believed it, is indicated by the entries of Bates and Welles in their diaries for September 23. Howard K. Beale, ed., *The Diary of Edward Bates, 1859-1866* (Washington, 1933), p. 412; John T. Morse, ed., *Diary of Gideon Welles* (Boston, 1911), II, 156. See also a letter of Blair to his wife, Smith, II, 288.

[4] James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850* (New York, 1902), IV, 529.

quoting Colonel W. O. Stoddard, whom he elevates to a position in charge of Lincoln's correspondence, to the effect that his "opinion, or half memory, would be that the tradition is a myth".[5] But Stephenson, however shrewd his surmise may have been, had no tangible evidence to support his position.

Six years later Allan Nevins published his *Frémont*. Therein he not merely challenged the bargain theory but supported his case with citations from Frémont's manuscript memoirs. According to this new evidence, Chandler had, to be sure, approached Frémont for the purpose of bargaining, and he had offered as a *quid pro quo* not merely the removal of Blair but also the restoration of Frémont to a high command in the army. But, and here was Nevins's startling contribution, Frémont, after turning the matter over in his mind for a week, flatly refused to be a party to such an arrangement. Nevertheless, under the persuasion of David Dudley Field, his adviser, friend, and attorney, he announced that he would withdraw for the welfare of the party. He demanded no pound of flesh. Nevins saw in this "an act of pure patriotism".[6]

Not all subsequent writers on the event, however, have followed Nevins. William E. Smith accepts his entire account of the interview between Chandler and the Frémont leaders as valid, but nevertheless deals with subsequent events as if the bargain had been consummated. Chandler, he says, "rushed back to Washington to complete the bargain with the President. An interview with him on September 22 brought matters to a successful close. On the same day, Fremont kept his part of the bargain by publishing the letter in which he withdrew his name as a presidential candidate."[7] William Starr Myers, perhaps awaiting fuller evidence, likewise leans to the bargain theory. Handling it cautiously with an "it is said" clause, he nevertheless concludes his discussion with the statement that Blair knew "he was a sacrifice to the enmity of the Fremont and other radicals".[8] Ruhl Jacob Bartlett takes a similar stand,[9] while Winfred A. Harbison, in an able note in the *Mississippi*

[5] Stephenson, *Lincoln* (Indianapolis, 1924), pp. 391 and 507-508, n. 5. The credibility of Stoddard even with regard to points on which he should have been better informed than on this has been disproved by J. G. Randall in "Has the Lincoln Theme been Exhausted?" *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XLI (Jan., 1936), 283-284 and n. 51.

[6] Nevins, *Frémont, the West's Greatest Adventurer* (New York, 1928), II, 665.

[7] Smith, II, 286.

[8] Myers, *A Study in Personality: General George Brinton McClellan* (New York, 1934), p. 448.

[9] *John C. Frémont and the Republican Party* (Columbus, 1930), pp. 128-129.

Valley Historical Review, cites a number of previously unpublished Chandler letters which lead him to accept the bargain story as valid.[10]

Nevertheless there are extant, but as yet unused by historians, certain documents which seem to clinch the fact that there was no bargain between Lincoln and Frémont. At the same time these documents contain entirely new and illuminating information. They indicate that Chandler's conference with Frémont was not the only one of similar import, and, what is perhaps more significant, they intimate that Frémont came very close to withdrawing in favor of McClellan and the Democrats rather than in favor of the Republicans. Consisting of a letter and a copy of part of a telegram, this new material is to be found in the George B. McClellan Manuscripts in the Library of Congress.[11] It does not constitute conclusive evidence in itself, but it at least affords reason for believing that the final version of Frémont's withdrawal has not yet been written. Where it supplements evidence already unearthed, it may reasonably be considered confirmatory. Where it advances to new ground, it points the way to additional research.

There is an interesting story connected with these documents. During the summer of 1864 Colonel R. B. Marcy, father-in-law of McClellan and his former chief of staff, was stationed at St. Louis. Feeling that he might from time to time uncover valuable political information of a confidential nature, he arranged with McClellan to communicate with him by code. The code was a simple numerical one, with numbers for each letter of the alphabet and, for the purpose of greater safety, code

[10] Harbison, "Zachariah Chandler's Part in the Reëlection of Abraham Lincoln", XXII (Sept., 1935), 267-276. The present writer is unable to see that the Chandler letters present any evidence which would require an alteration in Nevins's account. Professor Harbison evidently bases his conclusion that the bargain was actually consummated upon Chandler's statement to his wife: "I have succeeded in all that I have undertaken" (p. 274). But Chandler says nothing about having coupled Blair's resignation with Fremont's withdrawal. It is Wade, who, before Chandler had reported back to him, suggests that (p. 275). Chandler's main purpose, so far as Fremont was concerned, was to get him out of the race; the means were comparatively unimportant. He succeeded in doing so; therefore his claim to complete success is understandable. But there is nothing to show that he did not achieve his end in the rather unexpected fashion Nevins indicates, while there is other evidence to substantiate the Nevins view. Chandler was undoubtedly responsible for the immediate moves which led to both the removal of Blair and the withdrawal of Fremont, but there is little except hearsay evidence to show that there was any direct connection between the two events.

[11] The letter is out of chronological order in the McClellan MSS. The reference is ser. 2, vol. XV, f. 87009. The copy of the telegram is found in ser. 2, vol. XX, f. 88242. Professor Myers has published McClellan's transcription of the code letter, surmising correctly that it was from Colonel Marcy (p. 448). The original is signed.

words to designate the leading figures in public life. Thus Lincoln was "Lion", and General Rosecrans, then in command at St. Louis, was "Cincinnatti" [*sic*].

On September 20 Marcy wrote McClellan in code that on that day he had talked with General Justus McKinstry, former provost marshal on Frémont's staff, who claimed to be Frémont's confidential adviser. This claim, said Marcy, was credited by leading St. Louis Democrats. In the course of the conversation McKinstry told Marcy that he was "authorized by Fremont *to make any arrangement which the Democrats determined to be best in regard to running or withdrawing from the Presidential contest*".[12]

Two days later, before Frémont's withdrawal had been published in the newspapers, Marcy wired another code message to McClellan. The major part of the telegram was suppressed by the Western Union superintendent at Cincinnati, probably as a result of the Order of American Knights scare that summer. Only a fragment, which was relayed to Pittsburgh before the suppression, reached McClellan. This was mailed *sub rosa* by the manager of the Pittsburgh office, who happened to be an admirer of McClellan's. This fragment contained interesting information. McKinstry, it stated, had just received Frémont's withdrawal from the campaign, to be released to the press upon telegraphic notice. According to McKinstry, Frémont had been approached by Chase and Henry Wilson with the promise of a position in the Cabinet and the dismissal of the two Blairs "if he would withdraw and advocate Lion". Frémont replied that this was "an insult"; here the message ends.[13]

In the light of this new material the "bargain" of 1864, so far as it affected Frémont, would seem to be a rather doubtful quantity. Here is the second bit of evidence, this time contemporary with the events it concerns, that a definite proposal from Lincoln was made to Frémont, perhaps on two different occasions, in two different forms, by two different sets of spokesmen, and that Frémont turned it down. The harsh tone of Frémont's letter of withdrawal might almost be taken as a third bit. "In respect to Mr. Lincoln", he stated, ". . . I consider that his administration has been politically, militarily, and financially a failure, and that its necessary continuance is a cause of regret for the country."[14] This is hardly the language of a man who has made a political "deal",

[12] McClellan MSS., ser. 2, vol. XV, f. 87009. The italics are mine.

[13] *Ibid.*, vol. XX, f. 88242.

[14] Edward McPherson, *The Political History of the . . . Great Rebellion* (2d ed., Washington, 1865), p. 426.

even if he be a sorrowful and disappointed man.[15] Whatever bargain was made, then, seems to have been between Lincoln on one side and Wade and Davis on the other. Frémont appears to have remained on the outside. Therefore his act in withdrawing requires a special explanation.

It seems not unreasonable that the following may be the essential facts in the Lincoln-Blair-Frémont relationship. By early September the conspiracy to sidetrack Lincoln in favor of Chase had collapsed, and the Radical Republicans were ready to concede defeat. On September 13 Chase noted in his diary that there was no hope for the radical movement, and on the next day he announced that he would take the stump for Lincoln.[16] Rumors were abroad even earlier that he was about to endorse Lincoln.[17]

In the meantime the Democratic National Convention had nominated General McClellan for President and had endeavored to capitalize upon the violent wave of defeatism, which was sweeping the country, by demanding in their platform an armistice "to the end that at the earliest practicable moment peace may be restored on the basis of the Federal Union of the States".[18] Fearing an extremely close election, in which the Republicans might be beaten as a result of division among themselves, some of the erstwhile anti-Lincoln leaders saw the absolute necessity of pulling the party together, at least until after the campaign was over. Frémont's vote, small as it was certain to be, might be the margin between defeat and victory in certain states and in the election as a whole. Therefore it was necessary to secure that vote somehow. Equally imperative was the mollifying of such seeming irreconcilables as Wade and Davis, who were sulking in their tents. Chandler and perhaps Chase himself seem to have believed that they could kill two birds with one stone. Blair's removal would satisfy the irreconcilables, to say nothing of pleasing themselves, and, at the same time, might lead Frémont, if it were coupled with a promise of re-employment in the army or appointment to the Cabinet, to abandon his candidacy. Thus the Republican front would be reunited against the Democrats.

Lincoln was amenable to the plan. Re-election was, for reasons of

[15] Lincoln's explanation to Welles that the removal was made to satisfy Chase's friends (Welles, *Diary*, II, 158 n.) might almost be taken as another bit of evidence.

[16] Donnal V. Smith, *Chase and Civil War Politics* (Columbus, 1931), p. 157.

[17] J. B. McCullough, Cincinnati, to John Sherman, Sept. 6, 1864, John Sherman MSS., vol. LXXIII.

[18] McPherson, p. 419.

state, the all-important matter to him, and he was willing to make whatever concession was necessary in order to ensure it. As a matter of fact, it seems quite possible that he had already determined to drop Blair [19] but was merely awaiting the "psychological moment". It is hard to believe that he had ever expected to stand out to the bitter end against the sixth resolution in his party platform, which undoubtedly was a thinly veiled demand for Blair's head.[20] But Frémont nearly proved to be the stumbling block to complete unity.

By the middle of September Frémont had apparently come to realize the complete hopelessness of his candidacy. During August, when the North was virtually engulfed in a wave of defeatism, he had attempted to strengthen his cause by coming out boldly for compensated emancipation and committing himself more or less directly to a negotiated peace.[21] But the Democratic platform, adopted shortly afterward, and McClellan's views on slavery served to take most of the force out of this pronouncement, while the victories of Farragut, Sherman, and Sheridan in August and September would have rendered ridiculous any attempt he might have made to scramble back to the blood and iron platform upon which he had been nominated. Frémont clearly had sat down between two chairs and realized it. Actually he had privately announced his withdrawal from the race some five days before the publication of his formal renunciation.[22]

Amid the wreckage of his political hopes, Frémont appears to have been on the lookout for something definite to cling to. A political deal with Lincoln, whom he heartily disliked and who, he believed, had used

[19] This is Donnal V. Smith's interpretation. It clashes definitely with Chandler's description of his difficulties with Lincoln (Harbison, *op. cit.*, p. 273), but this does not necessarily prove it to be wrong. Lincoln was too shrewd a politician to reveal his hand to Chandler, and his apparent reluctance may well have been for effect. Professor Smith makes a pertinent point in attaching unusual significance to Lincoln's sudden recall of Blair from New Hampshire on September 1, before Chandler had approached the President. Furthermore, the urgency of Lincoln's second telegram, sent on September 3 (John G. Nicolay and John Hay, *The Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln*, New York, 1905-1906, II, 571), indicates that something unusual was afoot, though even Blair, as he insisted to Welles and Bates (Welles, *Diary*, II, 156), did not suspect it. The Nicolay and Hay version of the dismissal (*Abraham Lincoln: a History*, New York, 1890, IX, 339-340) affords every reason to believe that it was not suddenly determined upon.

[20] McPherson, p. 406. For examples of the pressure brought to bear upon Lincoln for Blair's dismissal, see Bates, *Diary*, p. 347, and Theodore Calvin Pease and James G. Randall, eds., *The Diary of Orville Hickman Browning* (Springfield, 1925), I, 677.

[21] McPherson, p. 426.

[22] *Ibid.* Chandler was not aware of this fact and continued to dicker with Frémont after the latter's private announcement had gone out.

him badly, was naturally distasteful to him, and it was certain to be pathetically transparent as soon as it should be consummated. Therefore, by means of McKinstry's contact with Marcy, he turned to McClellan, whom he had earlier endeavored to sound out.[23] An agreement here, he seems to have believed, had great possibilities, for if, as seemed to be the case, Lincoln was depending upon the Frémont votes for reelection, those same votes could elect McClellan and place himself in the position of kingmaker. Furthermore, by putting McClellan in the White House, Frémont would be enabled to square his account with Lincoln.

Unfortunately for Frémont, however, McClellan apparently ignored his overtures completely. There was then only one thing left for him to do. That was to withdraw in favor of the Republicans. Doing so, he could pose as a self-sacrificing patriot, which was a favorite pose with him. Furthermore, he could perhaps place the party under obligations to him for the future and at the same time rebuke McClellan. Finally, he could preserve his self-esteem by denouncing Lincoln himself in the roundest terms. Therefore his letter of withdrawal, which was published on September 22.

On the next day Lincoln called for Blair's resignation. Here was the psychological moment he had been awaiting. The Chase group had admitted their failure. Wade and Davis had signified their willingness to accept Blair's removal as a peace offering. The Republican press of the country, denouncing the Democratic platform as a sellout to the Confederacy, was convincing the electorate. The telegraph wires were hot with military victory. There is no reason to believe that Blair would not have been dismissed on September 23 regardless of Frémont's action. The Frémont letter was merely additional proof that the psychological moment had really arrived.

CHARLES R. WILSON.

Colgate University.

[23] E. H. Wright, Washington, to McClellan, Mar. 15, 1864, McClellan MSS., ser. 2, vol. XIV.

DOCUMENTS

A Carolina Democrat on Party Prospects in 1844

Armistead Burt was born in Edgefield district (county), South Carolina, in 1802. His parents soon after removed to the village of Pendleton, in the district of the same name. A few years later John C. Calhoun took up his residence at Fort Hill, four miles from there. After graduation from the Pendleton Academy, Burt read law in the office of Warren R. Davis, an able attorney of Pendleton. Admitted to the bar in 1823, Burt practiced at Pendleton until 1828, when he moved to Abbeville, where he died in 1883. The very year he went to Abbeville he married Martha Calhoun, the niece of John C. It was in this Burt-Calhoun home, still standing, that Mrs. Jefferson Davis was received when she fled from Richmond in 1865. And here her husband followed her and held his next to the last cabinet meeting—the *last* one, Abbeville claims, dismissing with a shrug the meeting of a few members in Georgia later.[1] Burt formed a partnership with Nathan Lipscomb Griffin, a very able and distinguished lawyer of Edgefield. Each member of the firm looked after, primarily, the business in his own county. Both partners made very comfortable incomes.

An ardent state rights Democrat, Burt was an active member of the Nullification Convention of 1832. Thereafter he served for several terms in the lower house of the state legislature. He was elected to represent his district in Congress in 1842, defeating Whitfield Brooks of Edgefield, the father of Preston S. Brooks, who succeeded Burt. The latter was re-elected continuously until 1852, when he declined to run again. During the absence of the speaker, R. C. Winthrop of Massachusetts, in 1848, Burt was chosen speaker pro tempore. He was not at his best as a congressman. One who knew him intimately said that he "did not take the stand which his talents and learning and high character entitled him to assume. The bar was his great forte. He was a lawyer, not a statesman."[2] His eminence as a jurist is indicated by the fact that

[1] J. E. Walmsley, "The Last Meeting of the Confederate Cabinet", *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, VI, 336; Mrs. Jefferson Davis, *Jefferson Davis* (New York, 1890), II, 612.

[2] B. F. Perry, *Reminiscences of Public Men* (2d ser., Greenville, 1889), p. 7.

Provisional Governor Perry chose him as one of a committee of two distinguished lawyers to draft South Carolina's Black Code in 1865.

Burt was famous as a raconteur and a wit. At the table of a common friend in Charleston he was once twitting a younger attorney with having been born in Edgefield. "It ill becomes you, Mr. Burt," retorted his victim, "to disparage Edgefield. I well recall hearing you proclaim from the Edgefield courthouse steps, when you were a candidate for Congress, that your proudest boast was that you had been born within a stone's throw of that spot." "Ah yes, quite true. *But did you ever hear me boast of that anywhere but in Edgefield?*"

The letter which follows was found in the papers of Burt's partner, Nathan L. Griffin, and through Griffin's son-in-law reached the present writer. It speaks for itself.[3]

Milledge L. Bonham, jr.

Hamilton College.

Armistead Burt to Nathan L. Griffin

House Reps.
10 Jany. 1844

My dear Sir,

I have purposely delayed a letter to you in the hope that I might be able to communicate something definite on the subjects of especial interest to the South. And I much regret that I am still able to send you nothing but speculations.

On my arrival at Washington I ascertained within a few days that the omens had spoken strongly and decidedly against Mr. Calhoun and apparently as decidedly for Mr. Van Buren. Subsequent developments have confirmed these indications. The determination of Mr. Calhoun to withhold his name from the convention, and his reasons for that course which were read to us ten days ago, called together the Delegation for consultation and conference. A majority, including our Senators [D. E. Huger and George McDuffie], advised that we await the policy of the Democratic Party in Congress on the Tariff before we should change our position in regard to the Presidential Election. The delegation, with as I believe, one exception, was disposed to make some essential and decidedly marked reductions of the duties, the only condition on which the nominee of the Baltimore Convention could claim any good from us, if indeed our support. The policy on which our State united with the Democratic party was founded upon the principles of the Republican party, and prominently in that creed is the principle that Taxes in any form can be rightfully levied only for revenue. The number of Whigs in this House is only fifty nine, of the whole number, which is two hundred and twenty three. With this immense majority you have seen that the House has repeatedly refused to instruct the Committee on Ways and Means to report a Tariff bill on revenue principles. These

[3] For other details about Burt, see Perry, pp. 5-12; *Biographical Congressional Directory* (1911), p. 517; *Appletons' Cyclopædia of American Biography*, I, 471.

votes were regarded here as indications to be relied on that the protective policy will be adhered to by a portion of that party; a portion, which by acting with the Whigs can entail upon us the principle of the protective policy.

But it is said of some of those who voted against these resolutions of instruction that they intend to reduce the duties, even below the rate of Rhett's Resolution, and below that which Mr. Calhoun himself allowed. And the reason assigned by the Van Buren leaders for the vote of their party is that the Committee of Ways and Means intend a reduction of duties, and would be offended by instructions to do it. How far these declarations at this day are to be accepted against their acts now and heretofore, is a question that it needs no time to answer by those who have had the credulity to believe them and the fortune to be deceived and betrayed whenever they did believe.

I shall not be much surprised if some reduction of the duties be made, because I do not perceive how else the revenue which is demanded by the inevitable wants of the Treasury can be supplied. Some slight and deceptive concessions on that subject may be deemed necessary to quiet and delude the South in view of the approaching Presidential election. You will see a show of effort to reduce the expenditures of the Government, for the same reason, but you should not mistake it for a manifestation of a spirit and determination to retrench.

I find myself not only authorised but bound to declare my serious and painful conviction that our democratic friends of the North and East, and a portion of them from the West are not as they professed to be, Free Trade men, and that all our hopes from them on this subject, are founded on their desire to elect Mr. Van Buren, and their fear of offending the South. They will deserve our denunciations if they refuse to abandon the protective policy and not our thanks if they do reduce the duties.

I desire to call attention to the course which they have pursued on the subject of abolition and to say I consider that the domestic institution of the South has been recently assailed by enemies greatly increased in numbers, zeal and talents. Their assaults are now made in every mode and by every means that hypocrisy and fanaticism can contrive or suggest.

It is assailed in every form in which it can be reached by the Committee on the Judiciary, to which the House actually referred a petition from a runaway Virginia slave, who is in jail in this City, and made the presentation of this petition the occasion of much excitement. The Resolves of the Legislature of Massachusetts, proposing an amendment of the Constitution of the United States by which our slaves should not be an element in the Representation of this House, have been referred to a Select Committee, two or three members of which are in favor of the recommendation. And it is assailed by attempts in the House to abolish the rule which rejects all abolition petitions; a rule which has stood several sessions of the Congress, and constitutes our only security against insult and contumely whilst sitting as members in this House.

I suppose but few will be found cold and reckless enough to support the proposed amendment of the constitution, but it is now conceded, and it is a just inference from the vote of a majority of the House, that this rule will be abandoned. What rule will be substituted, if any at all, is matter of mere conjecture. The Legislature of Massachusetts, at its last session, passed a law making it penal for any Magistrate of that State, Sheriff, Jailer or other officer to aid in the recovery by a master of his fugitive slave within the limits of

that State. You know, the act of Congress of 1790 makes it the duty of these officers to afford this aid. And Mr. Adams has said in my presence that this act of Congress will never be enforced in any non-slave holding State. That it is a dead letter.

The designs of the abolitionists are an attack on slavery through the process of amendment to the Constitution, and, Mr. Adams declares, the North will require it as the condition of the continuance of this Union. Indeed he declared that unless this amendment be made, the Union would be *speedily* dissolved.

Although the Democrats of the East, the North and the West disavow all connexion with these men, and hostility to their purposes, they admit that so strong is public opinion amongst them against the rule of this House respecting abolition petitions that they can not vote for the rule and keep their seats in Congress. With these facts before us and with vacillation concerning them by the friends of Mr. Van Buren it becomes a question of grave consideration, what course South Carolina and her Representatives should pursue in the Presidential election. I take for granted we can not support Mr. Clay, because by doing so, we should renounce all our cherished principles and measures. If the Van Buren party do not adhere to the free Trade principles, and especially if they are faithless alike to their duties and our rights on the subject of abolition, we can perceive no ground on which we can become his partisans without a like surrender of our principles and policy.

We are disposed, in the event that our just and reasonable expectations should be disappointed—the betrayal of our rights and the disappointment of our hopes, to raise the Banner of Calhoun and Free Trade. We think this the only course which is left us to pursue within our principles, or indeed our self respect. Calhoun will consent to this course, and despairing of any such modification of the Tariff as would be satisfactory to the South, I decided at once to take position and raise up the Flag. I shall be glad to hear from you on this subject, and to have the views and feelings of your friends. We have passed the Bill to refund the fine to Jackson, and on the same day (8th Inst.) the Democracy had quite a glorification supper. Spencer has been nominated for the vacancy on the Bench, but the rumor is he will be rejected. The fate of Mr. Hursham is considered doubtful.

It is said that the Whigs and Tyler have made friends. How this may be I have no positive information. Mr. Rives, of Virginia, has taken ground for Mr. Clay, and there can be no doubt that his prospects are brightening every day.

It seems to be conceded that unless Mr. Van Buren's party take boldly the anti-protection ground, and can rally that party as well as retain his own, he must be beaten.

I have written amidst much confusion, and must close this letter with the request that you write me fully and soon.

Yours truly

A. Burt

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL HISTORY

Adventures in Reputation: with an Essay on Some "New" History and Historians. By WILBUR C. ABBOTT, Francis Lee Higginson Professor of History in Harvard University. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1935. Pp. 264. $2.50.)

NEARLY a dozen years ago Professor Abbott published a volume of essays under the arresting title of *Conflicts with Oblivion*. Distinguished by insight into character, wide reading, and an engaging style, salted with humor, it has deservedly reached a second edition. Now comes a sequel—*Adventures in Reputation*—consisting of critical estimates of five English worthies, two essays which, though decidedly diverse in subject, are coupled together under the heading "Early Americana", and an eighth, which is a pungent appraisal of "Some 'New' History and Historians". The latter, as well as some of the others, have already appeared elsewhere, though not in precisely the same form.

"Thomas Babington Macaulay, Historian" is the first of the series and in general is an adequate and vivid portrayal of that notable figure in public life and in scholarship, and of the Victorian setting as well. It is a commonplace that many of Macaulay's detractors are those who as students had their views colored by critics and teachers. While Macaulay was unrivaled in his power of picturing dramatic situations and his ability to digest vast funds of knowledge, his manifest weakness was in characterization, and that was due not wholly to Whig partisanship but also to his lack of subtlety, to his proneness to balance contrasted traits. At the risk of repeating the obvious, that might have been emphasized again by the author. In undertaking to paint a large subject on a small canvas a few details are bound to be open to question. For example, scholars and theologians have, on occasion, been decidedly belligerent; more might be said for Croker's edition of Boswell than is here implied; in spite of his violence Mr. Winston Churchill has made a stronger case on some points in connection with Marlborough than is here indicated. While Professor Abbott is rather inclined to make his points in groups of threes, he usually has good grounds as far as they go.

Chesterfield, in the second essay, is pictured chiefly as an aristocrat. In addition to the plumbing of his many-sided character, we are furnished with a discerning survey of the characteristic features of the life of the Whig aristocracy of the eighteenth century. Among the well-selected quotations is one from Chesterfield to his godson on pride of birth. Some of the author's

own pungent bits lend themselves to quotation, as the definition of society which "echoes the immemorial strivings of humanity after the pleasant emptinesses of a life at once delightful and barren". While it may be true that Chesterfield hated lies and liars, the reviewer seems to recall that he advised the practice of simulation on occasion. However, these few pages help us the better to understand a complex and rather inscrutable character.

Since Mr. E. F. Benson, one of the best of the more popular biographers, has placed Queen Victoria in a truer perspective than that in which she was viewed under the "adroit disparagement" of Lytton Strachey, there seems less need of another appraisal of the "good Queen". Nevertheless, there is some acceptable writing here on significant phases of the Victorian age. One or two points call for comment. Victoria became heiress presumptive, not apparent, in 1830, and perhaps it would be fairer to Melbourne—noted for his profanity and his erudiction—to say that his wife's eccentricities, verging on insanity, really forced the separation which he secured. More stress might possibly be laid on the increase of the popularity of Victoria during her last years as the personification of the growing enthusiasm for empire.

The paper on "The Historic Cromwell" is largely a résumé of the literature reflecting the varying views of successive biographers. This is a subject on which Professor Abbott is an authority, as attested by his substantial bibliography which appeared in 1929. In addition to what he has to say of the printed works he has interesting bits about the vicissitudes of the manuscripts, particularly the Thurloe Papers. Carlyle's tart designation of Mark Noble's *Memoirs* as "an aggregate of bewildered jottings" perhaps deserved insertion once more. A word or two as to why Hume wrote from the Tory point of view might not have been amiss here, even though he is provided with a separate essay. It follows that on Cromwell and is an informing and exceedingly interesting estimate of one of the most acute intellects that Great Britain has ever produced, who, though primarily notable as a philosopher, wrote a history that reigned supreme from the middle of the eighteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century. One statement may need qualification. The reviewer can but wonder whether Professor Abbott, in stating that our generation is more skeptical than Hume, overlooks the Fundamentalists.

The essays on George Washington's imported farm bailiff and on "Lecompton" are each, in their respective ways, uncommonly good reading. In connection with the latter, one may venture to remark that the author, like Professor Carl Becker, has taken occasion to profit by a sojourn in Kansas to produce a piece of real literature. The discussion of "Some 'New' History and Historians", here reprinted, would require a separate review to do it justice. Suffice to say that it is sound doctrine cogently if somewhat acridly expressed.

The University of Michigan. ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

Hilfswörterbuch für Historiker: Mittelalter und Neuzeit. Von EUGEN HABERKERN und JOSEPH FRIEDRICH WALLACH. Mit einem Geleitwort von Hermann Oncken. (Berlin: Verlag für Staatswissenschaften und Geschichte. 1935. Pp. xiv, 605. 26 M.)

THIS work makes no pretence of being based on original research. The authors tried to satisfy the need of a practical and convenient dictionary of technical expressions most frequently met with in history. They aimed to help graduate students and instructors troubled about the meaning of terms in fields other than that of their specialization. Realizing that they could not be all-inclusive, they restricted their concern to expressions of a legal content and especially preferred those pertaining to administration, "the real scaffolding of history" (preface). But even in these fields the authors had to be selective. "We had to decide each case on its own merits, often by instinct", they confess; "often decisive was whether or not the expression played a role in the general historical literature" (preface). In the main, the authors chose the age of the barbarian migrations as one chronological terminus, and the Napoleonic period as the other; but in some cases, that of Christianity for example, they went back to the earlier period, and wherever feasible they brought the definitions of many expressions down to the Nazi revolution. Their treatment of those before and after the termini set depended upon the degree of historical continuity in the use of the expressions. For instance, if a term preserved in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries much of its previous meaning, they brought the definition up to date; if not, they dropped it at the beginning of the past century. They omitted entirely terms which apply peculiarly to the most recent period, like those in commercial law or those pertaining to the stock exchange. Geographical limits were also set. The area of concentration was Germany, then Central Europe and the neighbors of Germany, including England. For the rest of Europe, the European colonies, America, the Islamic regions, China and Japan, the authors handled only "the main lines of the administration", and they ignored entirely the native states of America and Africa. As to organization, they arranged the expressions, consisting either of a single word or of a phrase, in alphabetical order, and supplied numerous cross references. Their method was to define wherever possible, but mostly to explain by historical examples, with controversial points ignored.

A work of this sort cannot adequately be judged by one reviewer. The selection of terms seems to be well balanced and inclusive, and the explanations realize the authors' ambition of simplicity, clarity, and succinctness. The usefulness of the book in this country will necessarily be limited by the reader's knowledge of German. But even apart from that fact it appears at least open to question whether a work like this justifies itself. The energy which went into the making of it was enormous and the cost in proportion.

The authors ran the risk of oversimplification on the one hand and of overcomplexity on the other. Whether they struck the proper balance, only time and use will decide. Perhaps students of the history of literature or of some other branch of culture may need a glossary of this sort. Personally, the reviewer has permitted this copy to lie in his office for several months without finding any great occasion for using it. When he examined the book for this review, he found that where he wished information it did not help him. Closer acquaintance may improve his relations with the volume; at present he admires it mainly for the authors' good intentions and diligence.

American University. EUGENE N. ANDERSON.

Geschichte der neueren Historiographie. Von EDUARD FUETER. [Handbuch der mittelalterlichen und neueren Geschichte, herausgegeben von G. von Below, F. Meinecke, und A. Brackmann.] Dritte, um einen nachtrag vermehrte Auflage, besorgt von DIETRICH GERHARD und PAUL SATTLER. (Munich: R. Oldenbourg. 1936. Pp. xxii, 670. 21 M.)

WHEN Fueter's monumental work was first published twenty-five years ago, the critics, and the historical guild generally, hailed the book as a unique survey of the development of modern historical writing. At the same time, no one accepted the comprehensive manual without many reservations. Exceptions were taken to the division of the material, to the existence (or lack) of ideological bases for the author's judgments and appraisals, to the limitations of the plan (which Fueter carefully pointed out in his preface), and to his treatment of the individual historians. Today, despite a phenomenal growth of an interest in, and a literature on, the history of history, Fueter's critical conspectus remains unmatched, indeed, unapproached. Other similar studies have been written in the meanwhile, and, with emergence of new *Weltanschauungen* among historians, further faults have been found with the *Geschichte*. Nonetheless, the bulky volume is still the sole approximately competent guide to the modern history of our discipline, and we find it again reprinted, virtually unchanged.

It was, and is, too easy and vain to pick flaws in this panoramic lexicon. Fueter restricted himself to a history of historical writings as evidenced in books of a strictly historical character. He was not interested in chronicling the changes in the philosophy of history, except where they impinged upon working historians; he was not concerned with theories of historiography, except as they found concrete repercussions among productive historians. He set himself the task of surveying historical literature from the age of Petrarch to about 1870. He examined each of the principal works and historians with a single question in mind: what sort of a historical work had the particular historian produced? In seeking the answer he ignored everything but the book in question, often overlooking the personality of the author. The result

was an incredibly learned encyclopedia of historians and their writings, written with the penetrating criticism of a single, thoughtful mind tinged with what may be called a skeptical objectivity.

Published for the first time in 1911, it was slightly revised and enlarged by Fueter for the excellent French translation which appeared three years later. A second German edition was issued in 1925. The present version of the work is identical with the previous editions but provided with a new forty-five page bibliographical appendix. The compilers of the additional bibliography have added considerable value to the work by bringing Fueter's unparalleled bibliographical apparatus up to date.

Union College. FRANK J. MANHEIM.

An Historical Geography of Europe. By GORDON EAST, Lecturer in Historical Geography at the London School of Economics and Political Science. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1936. Pp. xx, 480. $5.00.)

THIS is an attempt to survey the historical or "human" geography of Europe from the Roman Empire to the Railway Age. Despite its five hundred pages it is selective in character, many omissions being necessitated by exigencies of space. Thus no account is given of the British Isles, nor of early Europe before the Roman Empire, where the archaeological material was too abundant to handle, and the work closes with the 1870's, which the author calls "the threshold of our present civilization". He merely presents various regions, successive stages or "period-pictures" from ancient, medieval, and modern history. This regional aspect of geography, the relationship of given states to their environment, is emphasized throughout. In this way the development of European nations is interpreted and likewise the historical trend of events in relation to geography—climate, topography, and resources. Furthermore, the work shows how unremitting has been the struggle carried on by every nation for liberty, which depends on the acquisition of new territory for expanding populations and of greater natural resources for industrial growth.

Instead of following a strictly chronological order the various chapters are arranged sequentially under three heads. (I) In the Geography of Settlement (pp. 3-135) the different types of settlement, their distribution and selection, are discussed, from the inception of the Roman Empire in 27 B.C. through the barbarian invasions, the evolution of towns, to the close of the Middle Ages, *ca.* 1500. Throughout this period colonial expansion is constantly linked with agriculture, "the predominant feature in European economy from the Roman period until the nineteenth century", and with industry. (II) Political Geography (pp. 139-296) traces the evolution of various European states from early state building in Western and Central Europe during the Germanic kingdoms, through the Byzantine and Arab empires, the

Russian state, the unification of France, the creation of Switzerland, Belgium, and Holland, down to the political unification of the German Empire in 1871. (III) Economic Geography (pp. 299-434) treats first of the Mediterranean area, then of the Baltic and North Sea regions and Western Europe, through the Middle Ages to the railway age.

Many of these chapters furnish delightful reading, such as XIV, on Sicily, which affords an excellent illustration on a small scale of changes in human geography correlated with history, and XVIII, on the Danube Route-Way, in which the author controverts the usual opinion of archaeologists that the Danube formed a "corridor" from the Black Sea to the upper Rhine for migrators and traders in prehistoric times. Moreover, he also shows that the Danube, in consequence of the physical conditions of the river and the distribution of resources among the peoples along its banks, has been only a third-rate waterway in historical times for migrations, travel, trade, and war.

In an epilogue (pp. 437-446) the diversity of present-day Europe, geographically, politically, culturally, and economically, is contrasted with its semblance of unity in the Middle Ages, a diversity so fundamental that it has led some writers to question the propriety of still using the term Europe to connote a distinct entity.

There is an excellent bibliography, chapter by chapter (pp. 449-471), and an eight-page index, the latter unfortunately not analytical. The work is clear and well organized and a distinct contribution to geography and history.

The University of Pennsylvania. WALTER WOODBURN HYDE.

Histoire d'Artois. Par A. MABILLE DE PONCHEVILLE.
Histoire de l'Ile-de-France. Par PIERRE BERNUS.
Histoire de Touraine. Par EUGÈNE PÉPIN. [Les vieilles provinces de France.] (Paris: Boivin. 1935; 1934; 1935. Pp. 277; xii, 282; xiii, 263. 20 fr. each.)

THESE three volumes uphold in general the high standard of the series of which they form a part. The Artois volume is the least successful despite an excellent introductory chapter and good chapters on Artois during the Great War and after; unfortunately it is not very well written, contains far too many and too long quotations, fails to emphasize properly fundamental trends and elements, and is too patriotic in tone. Yet as it stands, the volume is interesting and informing, a reasonably adequate account of a frontier province in which the Latin and northern spirits are fused, a province which has always been one of the stakes in a great European game all too frequently played upon its own soil.

The Ile-de-France volume is better in spite of special difficulties. The main emphasis is rightly upon the period before 1700, and there is necessarily great restraint in the treatment of the city of Paris. The curious phenomenon of central location in combination with frontier position is well

displayed. There are noteworthy chapters on the cultural history of the region. The illustrations are well chosen, and there is a valuable appendix on the *pays* of the Ile-de-France. The book is intelligently planned and well written.

The Touraine volume is by far the best of the three volumes now under review. The author, apparently well acquainted with the sources of information, has really explained the essential role of the Touraine region both in French and in general history and has described with some success the fundamental factors, geographic and otherwise, which have given the province and its inhabitants a special character. He has made the most of the high lights of his subject: the Touraine region, with Anjou, as the cradle of the Plantagenet family and Touraine, for two centuries, as the political, administrative, and artistic center of France. There is a useful appendix on the geographic subdivisions of the Touraine region. The last chapter, describing Touraine as it is today and stressing its qualities as the "Jardin de France", is particularly effective. There are excellent illustrations, some awareness at least of institutional history, some attention to economic factors throughout the volume, and a seventeenth century chapter which actually reveals some knowledge of administrative problems. The chapters on the sixteenth century, though good, are somewhat disappointing: Rabelais receives a single paragraph rather obviously inserted as an afterthought!

Smith College. SIDNEY R. PACKARD.

A History of the Church: an Introductory Study. By PHILIP HUGHES. Volume I, *The World in which the Church was Founded;* volume II, *The Church and the World the Church Created.* (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1935. Pp. xii, 397; xvi, 517. $3.50; $4.00.)

OUR author frankly asserts that he "presents the story from one point of view only", which is quite within his personal and scientific rights, but one may raise the question whether with such a restriction, affecting inclusion and exclusion of material as well as controlling interpretation, so general a title is justified. A more serious issue is involved when all works on church history except those by Roman Catholic scholars are excluded from the bibliographies. Not a few statements in this work would be modified if attention had been paid to some assured results of research by Protestant historians, and these at points where no theological question seems involved. The following may not be the best example, as a final opinion has not yet been reached, but the traditional flight of Arius to Nicomedia (I, 233) is likely to be carried along unquestioned by Roman Catholic historians until one of them consults the Reverend W. Telfer's note in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (XXXVII, 60-63).

The general thesis of this "Introductory Study" is expressed in the titles

of the successive volumes. The church was founded in a "world which was politically Roman and culturally Hellenic". That culture broke down in the West; in the East there was a "transformation into the new Byzantinism". The "chief architect" which rebuilt a civilization (the medieval world) "on the debris of the Romano-Hellenic culture in the West" was the church. A third volume, yet to appear, will bring the story down to our own times by describing the Christian world's revolt against the church which created it. The present reviewer will await this with special interest, for he was not anticipating this turn in the thesis—or is it a turn in phraseology only? The church of the two volumes before us is definitely what has become the Roman Catholic Church. What shall we find to be "the Christian world" that has revolted against it?

The greatest difficulty in reviewing this work for a historical journal lies in its amalgamation of historical facts and the theological presuppositions of the Roman Catholic Church. Further, there is a confusion of the Christian community and the Christian movement at large on the one side with the hierarchical institution on the other. Occasionally these are differentiated; more constantly they are identified. Moreover, to the additional confusion of readers who have quite other fundamental presuppositions, there is a conception of continuity which frequently carries back later developments into the earlier history. Our author recognizes this fallacy when "Heraclitus strove to read Stoicism into Homer" (I, 35), but proceeds to identify first and second century Christianity with the hierarchical church of the present day. There is a foreshortening of the years from 30 to 98 A.D., full two generations, a period practically as long as the entire pre-Civil War portion of our national history, the Empire of the Antonines being treated as the real background of "primitive Christianity". Another similar anachronism is seen in connection with the Nestorian controversy, where we are told (I, 296) of Mary, " 'Mother of God', she had always been to the ordinary faithful". There is no evidence to support such a statement, not even in the liturgical formulas of the first four centuries, where one would expect the idea, if not the phrase, to appear, if the fact as stated existed.

As one proceeds into the second volume, he is constantly impressed by a sense of remoteness in the dominant interests of the church. One of the liveliest enterprises of modern Roman Catholicism is the movement, international in scope, known as Catholic Action. To what extent can the strictly ecclesiastical concerns as narrated and described in these two volumes make any direct contribution in either method or inspiration to these modern interests? Perhaps the next volume will show us. Meanwhile, one can welcome and appreciate the high standard of Mr. Hughes's scholarship and his fine Christian spirit.

The Library of Congress. WILLIAM H. ALLISON.

Heer und Völkerschicksal: Betrachtung der Weltgeschichte vom Standpunkt des Soldaten. Von ALFRED VON PAWLIKOWSKI-CHOLEWA. (Munich: R. Oldenbourg. 1936. Pp. viii, 480. 8.50 M.)

THE author, a retired officer, for twenty-five years has collected materials from various sources for this treatise. His conviction is that the historian has failed to comprehend the full meaning of many important events because of inadequate knowledge of the technical side of war. A similar opinion has been expressed recently by Major Sanger in his treatment of Joseph E. Johnston (*Essays in Honor of William E. Dodd,* p. 257).

An impressive array of evidence is mustered to show how little the basic principles of military science have changed through the centuries. Most of our modern implements appeared on the scene, in a different guise to be sure, centuries ago. Gas had its counterpart in the paprika fire of the Chibchas and in the stink bombs which the early Chinese employed to rid themselves of river pirates; the tank had its forerunner in the *Sickelwagon* of Charles XII; the telegraph, in the semaphore and drum language. Of greater importance is the author's study of military formations and movements. Here too, with the use of convincing diagrams, he is able to demonstrate that modern tactics have advanced relatively little. The deployment at Leuthen was identical with that at Gaugamela; while the German tactics at Tannenberg were similar to those of Hannibal at Cannae.

The historian making an excursion into the realm of military affairs will do well to consult this volume, if for no other reason than to gain an appreciation of how such matters should be treated. The author makes no pretense of style; indeed his faithful recitation of divisions, regiments, and other units in the military chess game makes reading at times rather barren. The absence of an index is a misfortune.

"Si vis pacem, para bellum" is the philosophy running through the whole volume. High ideals and economic strength are no substitute for military knowledge and a trained army. No nation will dare to attack another that is well equipped for defense. These are the lessons that the military realist finds in world history. The pacifist is a utopian, unable to face historical facts. The youth of a nation would do well to study military history in order to avoid the pitfalls of a blind pacifism. The author ventures further in his observations. The development of military technique is as illustrative of the development of culture as progress in architecture; and finally, war is not necessarily destructive of civilization.

Princeton University. J. E. POMFRET.

The Cambridge Shorter History of India. By J. ALLAN, Keeper of the Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum, Sir T. WOLSELEY HAIG, Lecturer in Persian in the School of Oriental Studies, University of Lon-

don, H. H. DODWELL, Professor of the History and Culture of the British Dominions in Asia, the University of London. Edited by H. H. DODWELL. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1934. Pp. xix, 970. $4.00.)

Ceylon under British Rule, 1795-1932, with an Account of the East India Company's Embassies to Kandy, 1762-1795. By LENNOX A. MILLS, Assistant Professor, University of Minnesota. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1933. Pp. vi, 331. $5.00.)

THIS first work, based on the *Cambridge History of India* in many volumes, is in some ways a miracle of compression. Into nine hundred octavo pages the authors have packed the record of India from its early history, known by innumerable coins and epigraphs that have been deciphered in the last century, down to the Government of India Act of 1919. About half the book deals with British India—and one might wonder if a whole chapter on the Mutiny is not slightly out of proportion—but the invasions of Babur and the wars of Aurangzib, the obscure and distant maneuvers of the Chālukyas, the Rashtrakūtas, the Yādavas of Devagiri, the Hoysalas, and of many others are faithfully dealt with. It must be confessed that except for the professional scholar of Indian history or for the irrepressible enthusiast most of the first half of the volume will be almost unreadable. The proper names alone, which descend in clouds on every page and fill the index almost completely, make it difficult to see what is happening. Then, again, as in the larger *History,* there has been a singular neglect of the economic and social forces at work in India, at all events since the Mutiny, and as a result the niceties of dyarchy and the constitutional struggle lose much of their human significance. But it seems ungenerous to be too critical of a volume designed for the general reader and obviously the fruit of much labor. It will not be a popular book; but it will be distinctly serviceable—and quite portable. The twenty-one sketch maps are very useful.

Dr. Mills's volume is a noteworthy contribution to the literature of British colonial history in general, and in particular, of course, to the literature dealing with Ceylon, because, as he himself points out, it is the first "comprehensive account of the British regime" in that island written in over sixty years. In thirteen chapters he recounts the story, derived very largely from colonial office papers, of the coming to Ceylon of the British in 1762, their protracted and rather diffident negotiations with the island, and the century of evolving administration and development that followed. He traces very carefully the division of power between the crown and the East India Company in 1798 (an arrangement probably due, he conjectures, to "the failure of the peace negotiations at Lille and the consequent decision at least to postpone the return of Ceylon to Holland"), the coming of crown colony government, and so on down to the introduction of self-government, "to a large extent the result of Western education". The final chapter of the book surveys the evolution of Ceylon between 1889 and 1932. Although the canvas

is not large and the issues usually morsels of bigger ones elsewhere, Dr. Mills has succeeded in writing a very readable as well as a well-filled history of Ceylon. It is full of color, from the groans of John Pybus in 1762 to the doggerel of Sir Hardinge Gifford. It has more than color, though, for to the economic historian the chapters on the cinnamon trade and coffee and railway building in the nineteenth century will have real value and interest. It is through the account of these homely pursuits that one sees furthest into the origin of the true interest of a great colonial power in the land of the Sinhalese. There is a good bibliography of primary and secondary authorities, a full index, and an interesting map, with an equally interesting note on the same.

Upper Canada College. T. W. L. MacDermot.

ANCIENT HISTORY

Coins from Seleucia on the Tigris. By Robert Harbold McDowell. [University of Michigan Studies.] (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1935. Pp. xiv, 248, plates VI. $3.50.)

The progress of excavation from treasure hunting to applied science is well illustrated in the respect now paid to coins which used to be thrown aside as unworthy the attention of archaeologists. Pieces in fine condition, to be sure, have always been welcomed, but these are the rare exceptions, and it is only recently that the possibilities of others as historical records have been appreciated. It is now taken as a matter of course that at least a summary list of the coins is a necessary part of the excavator's report, and there is an increasing number of monographs which not only present the data but also draw conclusions. In this group of studies Professor McDowell's publication takes a high place both from the importance of the material itself and from the thoroughness and ability with which he has analyzed it. The volume is not a complete catalogue, for of the total of more than thirty thousand coins only twenty-six hundred are described. This is because the material was arbitrarily restricted to the Seleucid and Parthian empires, and even of that material only about a quarter was in good enough condition to be used. It is therefore not to be regarded as a complete report but as a special study based on excavation material. This results, of course, in much more prompt publication than would have been possible otherwise and does not in the least prejudice the later treatment of Roman, Sassanian, and Semitic coins, or the use of the whole body in connection with the history of the site and its various parts.

In the case of both Seleucid and Parthian domains the coins have great historical value because of the scantiness of the written sources, and the arrangement of the book makes the most of that value. Part I deals with the Seleucid coins, Part II with the Parthian, and in each section the same system

is used: first, a catalogue of the types found, with the numbers of each; second, numismatic notes on the types; third, general conclusions. The chief numismatic importance of Part I is that it shows which of the Seleucid bronze issues were from the mint at Seleucia—a matter of some difficulty to determine in the absence of mint marks. Seleucia evidently struck from the reign of Seleucus I (311-280 B.C.) to the first reign of Demetrius II (146-139 B.C.), except for the years of Seleucus II (226-223 B.C.) and Antiochus V (164-162 B.C.). The abundance of the output seems to have been affected to a certain extent by the actual presence of the ruler, but it is also a useful index of population and prosperity. The evidence leads to the belief that the city, founded somewhat before 300 B.C., received its first great increase in population under Antiochus I (280-261 B.C.) and experienced between 175 and 150 B.C. another period of expansion and prosperity, the basis of which was secure enough to allow the town to continue to flourish while the fortunes of the empire as a whole were declining as a result of civil war in the west and the rising power of the Parthians in the east.

In treating of the Parthian mint of Seleucia Professor McDowell is breaking virgin ground, for while Parthian coins in general have been studied by more than one scholar, there has never been sufficient evidence as to the provenance of the pieces to permit any attempt to connect them with particular cities of issue. But so much material has been accumulated by the University of Michigan that the author is enabled to give an exceedingly valuable catalogue of all issues, both silver and bronze, struck at Seleucia, a list which is almost continuous from 141 B.C. to 229 A.D. and which will certainly be the basis of all future work on the subject, even though it may later be modified in detail. As Professor McDowell is now occupied with a comprehensive study of Parthian coinage, this is a preliminary work which it would be premature to review too minutely, but some of his conclusions should be noticed.

The Parthians continued the use of the Seleucid calendar beginning, in the Babylonian fashion, in April, 311, while the Syrian reckoning is from October, 312. (The use of the phrase "Babylonian calendar" is somewhat confusing, for the months are Macedonian and not Babylonian.) The intercalation by which Xandikos instead of Artemisios became the first month (already discovered at Dura by Jotham Johnson) is here very neatly proved to have occurred between 16/17 A.D. and 46/47 A.D. It is the frequency with which tetradrachms are dated that furnishes the chief assistance in arranging them; conversely, there is a general absence of dating on the drachms, with certain exceptions. These two facts, combined with other considerations, produce the very important conclusion that almost all the tetradrachms were struck at Seleucia, almost all the drachms elsewhere.

The autonomous coinage gives an added insight into the individuality of the town, and no section of the book is more interesting than that wherein

the author discusses the relation of the city to the Parthian dynasty—the normal legitimist sympathies of the aristocracy and the tendency of democrats to support rebel leaders. Indeed the whole last chapter, dealing with the fortunes of the western Parthian provinces, is a contribution of the first importance to our knowledge of Parthian history. There are incidental pieces of new information, such as the fact that Seleucia was probably in Roman hands at the time of Trajan's expedition of 115/116, and that the date of Severus's capture of the city, as shown by a hoard, is after April, 198 (as against Hasebrock's date of September-October, 197). But of more significance is the general picture of the city's rise and fall. It was an alien foundation, maintaining its Hellenic culture for generations against the forces of the East, but succumbing to them in the end and going the way of all the settlements to which the genius of Alexander gave the occasion and the genius of Greece the power to persist.

Yale University. ALFRED R. BELLINGER.

Soknopaiou Nesos: the University of Michigan Excavations at Dimê in 1931-1932. Edited by ARTHUR E. R. BOAK, University of Michigan. [University of Michigan Studies.] (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1935. Pp. xii, 47, plans XVI. $2.50.)

THE site of Soknopaiou Nesos (modern Dimê) is about two kilometers from the north side of Lake Moeris (Birket Qarûn) and about sixteen meters above sea level. An ancient paved road leading from the temple precinct at the north end of the oval mound to a gateway at the south end divides the site into an eastern and a western half. The excavations of the winter of 1931-1932 uncovered on the eastern side of the mound a large building with vaulted underground rooms and a brick dome over the central underground chamber. The purpose of the building, from which all furnishings and decoration had been removed in antiquity, is unknown. Three smaller buildings were ordinary houses. The period of occupation extended from the early part of the first century B.C. to the early part of the first century A.D. On the west side of the mound four distinct periods of occupation were revealed. The original settlement probably flourished for fifty years, more or less, beginning about the middle of the third century B.C., after which a period of decay was followed by a brief revival about the middle of the second century. A second decline came on in the latter part of that century, but recovery began certainly before 74 B.C., to be followed by a brief period of decline which may be assigned to the years 51-47 B.C. The greatest prosperity of the community was in the first and second centuries A.D.

These results are confirmed by papyri previously found and by coins found in these excavations. The coins number only 95 (83 bronze, 11 billon, 1 silver) and are dated from Ptolemy IV (222-204 B.C.) to Antoninus Pius (138-161 A.D.), only one, of Constantius I (305-306 A.D.), being later.

Fifteen customs receipts with seals date, with three possible exceptions, from the time of Severus and his sons. They are discussed in detail. There are only two Greek inscriptions, both very fragmentary. Parts of two wall paintings were found in houses of the second level from the top. One of these represented, apparently, the rider god Heron, the other a cult act, apparently in worship of the god Soknopaios (Sobek). A great number of fishhooks would seem to indicate one source of livelihood of the inhabitants of the place. Other small objects found are few and of little interest. The site has been partially excavated and plundered at various times in the past and is not likely to reward more complete excavation, which would be exceptionally expensive. This excellent report may therefore be regarded as final.

The Library of Congress. HAROLD N. FOWLER.

A History of the Roman World from A.D. 138 to 337. By H. M. D. PARKER, Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen College, Oxford. [Methuen's History of the Greek and Roman World, General Editor, M. Cary.] (London: Methuen and Company. 1935. Pp. xii, 402. 15*s*.)

THIS book provides a good survey of the history of the Roman Empire from the accession of Antoninus Pius to the death of Constantine the Great. The two centuries from 138 to 337 A.D. are considered under the five general headings of the "Antonines", the "Dynasty of the Severi", the "Years of Anarchy", the "Restoration of Imperial Unity" (Claudius Gothicus to Carus), and the "Oriental Despotism". The institutional, economic, and social aspects of the last years of the principate as well as the historical narrative are presented in a manner which is, for the most part, irreproachable. The author has been especially successful in avoiding controversial topics with the result that, in general, the material contained in the book may be accepted as representing the opinion of the majority of scholars in the field.

On several points, however, Mr. Parker has differed from the older historians and has adopted new and more reasonable interpretations. He discards, for example, the theory of the "barbarization" of the army under Septimius Severus, showing that although the praetorian guard was recruited outside of Italy, its members, since they were legionaries, were necessarily Roman citizens. Therefore the extension of citizenship which came in the reign of Caracalla contributed more to the process of barbarization than did his father's reforms (pp. 82-84). An important effect of the Edict of Caracalla, often overlooked, is shown to be the increase in the number of those liable for compulsory state service (pp. 126-127). The myth that the Severi favored the peasants over the other classes in the empire is completely destroyed (pp. 127-128). The admission of senators to the praetorian prefecture under Severus Alexander was not a step to conciliate the senate but rather to arrange it so that the prefect, the representative of the emperor,

could preside at senatorial trials (p. 108). Mr. Parker is inclined to disregard the evidence of the DOMINUS ET DEUS (NATUS) coins of Aurelian and to question whether Aurelian was an advocate of the theory of divine right (pp. 208-209).

In the opinion of the present reviewer it would have been desirable to include a chapter in Part II, or at the least a section of a chapter, on the decline of the Parthians and the rise of the new Persian kingdom. This is the only adverse criticism of any importance which might be made. The discussion in the fourth and fifth chapters of Part V of the administrative, military, economic, and social reforms of Diocletian and Constantine is extremely good.

It is possible, contrary to the belief of Mr. Parker (p. 226), to suggest a cause for the revolt of the Bagaudae in 285. Both Idatius and the Chronograph of 354 mention a severe famine in the reign of Carinus. The unsettled conditions in Gaul may have been the result of a poor harvest, and the activities of the Bagaudae may be compared to the *Jacquerie* in that same region eleven hundred years later.

This book may be described most accurately by two words—adequate and useful.

The University of Minnesota. TOM B. JONES.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Les invasions germaniques: La pénétration mutuelle du monde barbare et du monde romain. Par FERDINAND LOT, professeur à la Sorbonne, membre de l'Institut. [Bibliothèque historique.] (Paris: Payot. 1935. Pp. 334. 20 fr.)

A considerable part of this volume deals with material already made familiar by Professor Lot in his brilliant general survey of the transition period from Constantine to the Carolingians. The narrative of the Germanic invasions is treated with some new detail, such as the interesting analysis of the Roman military establishment in the invasion period.

In the second part the author focuses on a subject of major importance, often alluded to and here for the first time (in the reviewer's knowledge) singled out for main consideration. It was present but obscured in the old battle between Germanists and Romanists, concerned with the relative contributions of their ancestors to European development. Professor Lot has gained by avoiding that approach; instead, he goes straight to a problem which is imposed by the facts of the period and is important in other terms than those of nineteenth century nationalism. We know that the unstable mixture of German and Roman populations lies behind the disorder and formlessness of the Dark Ages; we know that finally a fusion takes place

and that when it does we are on the threshold of a new order of society and civilization. But how, under what difficulties, in what ways, to what degree, did this fusion take place?

The table of contents shows further aspects of this focus. There is a short chapter on the problem of Germanic racial origins (accepting the strong Nordic hypothesis) but almost nothing on the civilization and institutions of the early Germans, no attempt to renew the timeworn interpretation of Caesar and Tacitus. The author is not going to deal in terms of a fusion of institutions and cultures, as did the old approach, but rather of two peoples, brought into contact in particular circumstances in the fifth century; one group a minority with political control, the other a more or less subject majority. Fusion means, in terms of this approach, that by the eighth century it is no longer possible to describe European society in terms of these groups and their relationships: their conscious identities are lost.

The analysis begins, then, with the situation after the invasions. How did the minority group behave toward the subject majority, and what other factors influenced their relationships? This does not involve a descriptive survey of sixth century institutions in their time-honored categories. Such general topics as religion, administration, and legal systems are considered as they concern the main issue. For example, there is detailed discussion of the significance of the lesser wergild assigned to Romans and of the fact that the *mallus,* a Germanic institution applied to new conditions, brought all elements of the population to a common court. But much more space is given to the results of linguistic research in the history of place names, which are drawn upon to determine the nature and density of German settlements and the degree of expropriation involved. The same approach and emphasis is maintained throughout as the author demonstrates the gradual *rapprochement* of the two peoples by evidence of their influence on each other's customs and ideas. Here again the linguistic material is given much prominence, while institutions, literature, and art are described only insofar as they are relevant to the main problem.

The analysis proceeds in point of time to the eighth century (further on some matters); geographically, it takes into separate consideration the main regions of western invasion, Spain, Italy, and Britain, as well as Gaul. But Gaul is given the most detailed attention, and in a concluding chapter Professor Lot indicates one way of bringing out the implications of his study for later history. The results of the process by which consciousness of "invaders" and "subjects" was lost meant the possibility of new peoples. In the former Gaul, when memories of Roman and German differences and antagonisms had disappeared, group consciousness could begin to develop around a new label, "Francia". The name was not inappropriate; it suggested the strong Germanic elements in the background out of which came

the French people. Sixteenth century France accepted Clovis as the first French national hero and forgot that he was a German conqueror; it remained for a later period to speculate as to whether the French aristocracy was descended from German invaders.

Harvard University. C. H. TAYLOR.

A History of the Anglo-Saxons. By R. H. HODGKIN, Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, Oxford. Two volumes. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. xxvii, 748. $10.00.)

THE author of this work is the son of Thomas Hodgkin, and it would seem that he has inherited not only the profession of historian but also in large measure the subject of his interest and in some degree his general outlook and even something of his manner of presentation. Being of the present generation, his work necessarily rests more largely on the researches of specialists and is correspondingly more solidly based, but it still has the sweep and roominess and charm with which the elder Hodgkin has made his readers familiar. The two volumes here presented constitute the first installment of an ambitious general work on the history of England before the Norman Conquest, a subject about which there has been not only a great increase of knowledge but a radical change of general views since Stubbs, Freeman, and Green taught the Victorians to see among the Anglo-Saxons the dawn of English democracy. It will perhaps give the best idea of the author's purpose if we suggest that he is writing to replace Green's *Making of England* (1881) and *Conquest of England* (1883) and so to revive a now flagging general interest in the Anglo-Saxons by presenting them attractively in the light of a half century of research and debate. It is high time, and the work is worthy of the effort which has gone into it. Whether the author will find readers in such numbers as Green did we cannot say, but we have no doubt that he richly deserves to do so.

Unquestionably the newest feature of this work, that which marks it off most conspicuously from any general history which has gone before it, is its comprehensive use of archaeology; and this is true not only of the detailed study of grave finds in their relation to chronology and topography, with a view to determining the character of the Saxon conquest of Britain, but also of the use of every kind of archaeological evidence for the purpose of reconstructing the life and culture of the people. Apart from the attention given to archaeology, the most vivid impression which the reader will carry away from these volumes is likely to be that of the great figures. "I have focused on the great men and the big subjects", says the author, and it must be recorded that he has done so with success. Here there is naturally less of novelty, though attention may be especially directed to the attempt to reconstruct the achievements of Ine of Wessex, but there is more of charm: the

chapter on the Golden Age, from Theodore and Hadrian to Bede, is perhaps the most readable in the book, and in the second volume the figure of Alfred, of course, towers above all others.

Though the author is largely dependent on the work of specialists, and though he appears to have done little himself in the way of specialized research, it is apparent on every hand that he has lived long with the sources and that he has thought independently and constructively about the fundamental problems of his subject. A bare enumeration of his views on some of the more controverted issues may perhaps be presented without too great unfairness. Archaeological evidence compels him to conclude that the Anglo-Saxon occupation of Britain was "more a colonization than a conquest", the work of scattered bands extending over a long period. On the question of the survival of the Romano-British population he holds a cautious middle ground: no general conclusion is possible; each area presents a separate problem. In the long-drawn controversy as to the fundamental character of Anglo-Saxon institutions in the age of the conquest, he rejects the democratic views of Stubbs and other older writers and stands with Chadwick and Miss Phillpotts. With respect to the church in the century after Bede, he challenges the traditional view that it was in a state of degradation; and the pages in which he discusses developments within the church in this age are among the most interesting in the book.

With most of the author's general views the present writer finds himself in sympathy; from only one is he disposed to dissent. Stephenson's recent *Borough and Town* is known to the author and is cited by him; yet it is evident that he is not a master of the more recent literature on the early history of medieval towns and commerce, and that he has failed to comprehend the full significance of Stephenson's work. Otherwise he would not attribute to the age of Charlemagne and Offa "a revival of trade such as the western world had not known since the fourth century", or conceive of London in the ninth century as an important emporium of trade, or still assign to the Danes the paternity of Alfred's burhs.

Rarely has a finer example of the printer's art issued from the Oxford University Press. Not only is the typography of a high order, but the volumes are beautifully and profusely illustrated, with some magnificent colored plates. Attention should also be directed to the admirable maps, many of them in color, which are supplied in abundance, usually appear just where they are wanted, and do much to elucidate the text. The handling of notes is far less satisfactory. Most references are much abbreviated, and for the key (which is incomplete) it is necessary to turn to the back of the second volume. Then there are two systems of annotation, and the distinction between them is not entirely clear. Footnotes appear at the bottom of many pages of the text, but most (not all) of the references to authorities are

relegated to the back of the second volume. Finally, there are "additional notes", which are evidently afterthoughts, hid away in the back of each volume. The reader who desires to follow the references and to learn the author's latest thoughts can hardly be blamed if at times he loses patience.

Bryn Mawr College. C. W. David.

Recherches sur la seigneurie rurale en Lorraine d'après les plus anciens Censiers, IX-XII siècle. Par Ch. Edmond Perrin, maître de conférences à la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg. [Publications de la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg.] (Paris: Les Belles Lettres. 1935. Pp. xxii, 809. 80 fr.)

As the author states in his preface, this book is a discussion of the materials available for the history of the rural *seigneurie* in Lorraine, rather than a history of the institution itself. To clear the ground for his proposed work on this later subject, M. Perrin has examined carefully the twenty *censiers*, dating from the ninth to the twelfth century, which contain descriptions of domains in Lorraine. He has dated each document as accurately as possible, indicated additions which have corrupted or modified the primitive text, and distinguished, when there was occasion, different types of redaction within the *censier*. In this delicate task M. Perrin has been aided by his remarkable knowledge of the sources for the history of Lorraine. These sources, of course, do not solve all of the problems raised by a study of the *censiers*, and many of M. Perrin's conclusions are based almost entirely on internal evidence. This dangerous method is used, on the whole, with great judgment and discretion. Although some of his less important statements might be challenged, the main points are convincingly established.

The *censiers* which M. Perrin discusses vary greatly in length and in importance to the general historian. Probably the most valuable study is that on the ninth century *censier* of Prüm, a document which every student of early medieval institutions must use. M. Perrin's conclusions about its date and the character of the original text are more satisfying than those found in earlier works on this subject. The discussion of the twelfth-century *censier* of St. Maximin of Treves is also important, since the possessions of this abbey were widely scattered and involve the history of several countries. In an appendix the texts of six hitherto unpublished *censiers* are given. They are all rather brief and are primarily important for local history.

In the concluding section of the book M. Perrin discusses the origin of *censiers*, without venturing any definite conclusions on the subject. Then the technique of making a *censier* is studied, and, last, the reasons for their decadence at the end of the twelfth century. The *censiers*, which reflected the villa system of agriculture, naturally lost their value when this old technique of exploitation became obsolete. In Lorraine, as elsewhere, domai-

nial rents and services lost most of their value during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. They were replaced by direct renting of land and by increased emphasis on the lords' rights of justice and ban. For this changed type of income new records were necessary, and the *censier* disappeared.

Princeton University. JOSEPH R. STRAYER.

Five Centuries of Religion. By G. G. COULTON, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Volume III, *Getting & Spending.* (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1936. Pp. li, 747. $12.50.)

"Un étranger vêtu de noir,
Qui me ressemble comme un frère."

Thus does Dr. Coulton, with a slightly disconcerting orthodoxy, invoke the shade of De Musset(!) to make his peace with the past. For years this reviewer has felt that something beyond disinterested research has been responsible for the continued blasts against monks, nuns, friars, and their modern champions. On page 599 of the third volume of this series (the which, by the way, might well have been called *Five Centuries of Religious*) the secret comes out. Dr. Coulton has succeeded in thinking himself back into the Middle Ages. He might wish "that there had been more heroes like those Pilgrim Fathers . . . from Molesme who created Cîteaux; but . . . no life can be contemptible in which we see ourselves reflected; our own thoughts and the things we might have done". This confession explains the change of tone so marked in this volume. There is none of the earlier rancor; in its stead a kindly appreciation, a mellow sympathy, but withal a scrupulous adherence to the available facts.

This volume is a delight. No one attracted by the Middle Ages should overlook it; no student of monasticism need seek indulgence if he be without it. The subtitle, *Getting & Spending,* implies an emphasis upon monastic finances, but there is a valuable chaos of miscellanea: the monastic use of trial by battle, a statistical table of monastic population, the reduction of the Eleven Thousand Virgins of Cologne to a more reasonable (if less pious) total of eleven, *et multissima alia.* As the author himself puts it: "This volume is less a history than materials for history", and its value lies not in the presentation of startling theses (for there is little that is really new), but in its excellent assimilation of materials beyond the research of the ninety and nine, an assimilation as gratifying in its literary facility as in its historic usefulness.

To the person who sees in medieval monasticism only hypocrisy, ignorance, and sloth, the book will afford but little satisfaction; to the enthusiastic idealist, it will offer little comfort. Dr. Coulton is dealing with "men who have no more claim to real heroism or real villainy than ourselves; men embedded in a society governed nominally by clear-cut theory and legislation,

but where theory is in many cases modified almost out of recognition by the pressure of natural personal inclinations and of inveterate social custom".

There is no bilking Dr. Coulton's demonstration that financial distress or downright avarice proved a more invincible enemy to medieval monks and nuns than all the demons in the *Dialogues* of Caesarius of Heisterbach. In the first thirty-three chapters Dr. Coulton has pretty well exhausted the various channels, natural or ingeniously contrived, through which funds flowed into the monasteries or into the coffers of individual monks; in the final eleven he discusses, adequately enough, the debit side of the account. The ratio is not without significance. The chapters on appropriated churches and on monastic banking and usury (X, XVI, XVIII) are useful, that on the "Commendam System" (XXVI) is excellent, that on monastic decay (XXXII) suggestive. The advanced student should find the hundred and more pages of appendixes eminently worth while.

Dr. Coulton is so fond of including a "Catena of Complaints" in his works that he cannot take it amiss if his reviewers go and do likewise. The abundance of material used is apt at times to get out of hand; all sorts of topics are mixed up in the same chapter. Dr. Coulton possesses something approaching genius in nomenclature, and such chapter headings as "The Privilege of Burial", "The Value of Masses", "The Relic Market", "Pious Thefts", "The Scramble for Tithes", "Irregular Book-keeping", "Debt and Repudiation", indicate the scope and purpose of the work. But he frequently indulges his passion for "snappy" titles at the expense of the contents (*e.g.*, chs. I, II, XXIV, XXXI). Again, it is not quite clear how he arrives at a modern evaluation of medieval money, for his multiple varies from 20 (p. 221) through 40 (pp. 222, 376) to 90 (p. 280)! It might also be pointed out that Eudes Rigaud (Odo Rigaldi) from whom he draws much of his evidence is not particularly reliable for monastic finances. Rigaud's own accounts were frequently incorrect despite his impatience with unbusinesslike abbots and priors. Nor is it quite fair to use Caesarius of Heisterbach's *Homilies* as evidence of an assured state of affairs. Those who have felt the barb of Dr. Coulton's scorn at their "impurisms" may revel in an unholy glee at page 434 where Homer nods and writes of "the evils arising from *commendae*", which would do well enough for you or me. On the assumption that a cat may look at a king, this reviewer would like to suggest, with due temerity, that chapter IV ("Relics") might have been improved by a use of R. Liddelsdale Palmer's *English Monasteries in the Middle Ages* (1930), in which there is a useful suggestion as to the influence of relic worship upon the development of monastic architecture. But when all carping has been done, the patent fact remains that in *Getting & Spending* Dr. Coulton has *not* laid waste his powers.

Lehigh University. SYDNEY M. BROWN.

Wellingborough Manorial Accounts, A.D. 1258-1323, from the Account Rolls of Crowland Abbey. Edited with an Introduction by FRANCES M. PAGE. [The Northamptonshire Record Society, XIII.] (Northampton: the Society. 1936. Pp. xxxviii, 144.)

THE documents in this volume form an important supplement to Miss Page's earlier work on the *Estates of Crowland Abbey*. The history of Wellingborough, the value of manorial accounts, their structure and concreteness of detail, and the method used in compiling them are set forth in an introduction, short but very repaying to the reader. The documents that follow, dating from 1258 to 1323, are edited with the care required by modern scholarship. The first and last are in Latin and are also translated; the others are in Latin only. A useful glossary of technical terms follows, and indexes of persons and places. The editor pays a well-deserved tribute to Miss Joan Wake, secretary of the Northamptonshire Record Society and editor of the series, to whom students of early England are already so greatly indebted.

The rolls show the classes of society living on this Lincolnshire manor. They included the *nativi operarii*, the *molmen*, that difficult group of people representing some early form of commutation, of whom one wishes the editor had had more to say, the *fiveacremen*, the cottars and lesser men, and the sokemen, who have "retained a modicum of freedom" for the recognition of which by the abbot they play a collective *frangware*. They show also the organization of the manor, the amount of arable, rotation of crops, demesne, mill, fisheries, ovens, and the like, and the renders therefrom to the lord abbot. An important note in the introduction, together with an elaborate table, is devoted to *redditus assise*, most difficult of manorial issues, a proper understanding of which seems essential to the study of commutation. Its many component parts are set forth and the position among them of commuted labor services, which are to be differentiated clearly from temporary sales of works. It is to careful and expert work like this of Miss Page that those of us who are interested in early English history must look for a clearer view of the variations of social conditions and estate exploitation that prevailed in different parts of medieval England and at different stages of economic development. We need, too, evidence like that furnished by this volume to prove that while feudalism was in some ways "detrimental to national unity", yet a great lord like the abbot of Crowland might do "work of administration on his widely-flung estates which contributed greatly to law and order and economic prosperity".

Mount Holyoke College. N. NEILSON.

Rotuli parliamentorum Anglie hactenus inediti, MCCLXXIX-MCCCLXXIII. Edited by H. G. RICHARDSON and GEORGE SAYLES. [Camden Third Series, Volume LI.] (London: Royal Historical Society. 1935. Pp. xxxii, 337.)

This volume continues the important studies that have been appearing under the same joint authorship on the early history of parliament. Without

excess of editorial comment the present contribution consists of the miscellaneous records that have been assiduously gathered from the compilations of the chancery, the exchequer, and other depositories, which have hitherto failed of publication. For the standard collection known as the *Rotuli parliamentorum*, however textually correct, has long been understood to be incomplete and defective. To say nothing of other limitations, a faulty method of previous editors was to omit canceled items, which might nonetheless have a historical value. Instead of a continuous roll the earliest records are to be found in detached membranes or in multiple small rolls, while some of the fleeting material survives only through the medium of later transcriptions. The purpose of enrollment for the sake of "perpetual memory" was often alluded to, but a substantial single roll was hardly maintained before 1341. Even then there continued to be transactions which were not entered in the regular roll.

So long as the hearing of petitions constituted the principal function of parliament, or the council in parliament according to the original conception, the major part of our text is necessarily devoted to private bills, the interest of which lies in the multifarious problems of suitors. In this connection the editors are inclined to accept the questionable interpretation of a hearing *in pleno parliamento* as being in public session, while a transaction in council is "behind closed doors" (p. xi). After 1327, under strong political pressure, there is a manifest tendency of parliament, especially the lords, to be absorbed in public business, leaving private petitions in the main to be treated in council. In the first year of Edward III a new panel of councilors, with the proposal that they be changed at every parliamentary session (p. 134), marks a step in the differentiation of the two bodies. At all times litigation held a prominent place in the rolls, wherein the pleadings might run to great length without reaching a final judgment. A most characteristic case was the process between Queen Isabella and the Prior of Coventry in 1336 over their respective claims to the town of Coventry, which was evidently begun in parliament and continued through many postponements before the council. Throughout the period it is remarkable that the king's demands for money and the consequent grants of supply, however important, never filled much space in the rolls. On this point the king's speech in 1325 is exceptionally illuminating (p. 95). Besides introduction, appendix, and index, a table of parliament rolls, and a glossary of Old French may be mentioned as distinctive achievements of the editors' work.

Vassar College. J. F. BALDWIN.

The Dawn of a New Era, 1250-1453. By EDWARD P. CHEYNEY, University of Pennsylvania. [The Rise of Modern Europe, edited by William L. Langer.] (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1936. Pp. x, 389. $3.75.)

In this volume Professor Cheyney not only portrays a vast sweep of human development within a brief compass, but he also selects those aspects

of it which best serve as an introduction to a series of volumes dealing with the history of modern Europe. Such a story is necessarily the product of a discriminative choice from a mass of evidence. The political narrative which ordinarily constitutes the background of volumes similar in scope drops out of sight, and the careers of few individuals receive more than passing mention. What is presented to the reader is a series of bold sketches of general movements which affected profoundly the lives of large groups of men during the period. They include the expansion of trade and capital, the changes in the methods of conducting business, the development of representative government, popular insurrections, the Hundred Years' War, the decline of the church, the spread of heresy, the rise of vernacular languages and literatures, the appearance of Humanism, new movements in art, the relations of Europe to the Far East, and the rise and fall of the peoples of eastern Europe. The nature of the sketches varies somewhat. The chapter on the church, though it is distinctively the handiwork of the author, follows a more or less conventionalized pattern, while the chapter on the Hundred Years' War, by subordinating the dreary tale of campaigns and battles, strategy and tactics, to consideration of the nature and significance of the war, brings home what it meant to contemporaries in terms of human agony. But in every sketch the hand of the master craftsman is apparent, and the collective effect is a fresh and appealing synthesis.

The material is drawn mainly from secondary sources, but it is weighed by a historian who is not only at home in the contemporary records but also, as becomes apparent in several portions of the narrative, has delved deeply into some of them. On many topics recent investigations which have added to our knowledge or modified older views have been utilized. The treatment of these topics presents many estimates and judgments which are not to be found in kindred surveys of the period and which could not have been put forward on the basis of the stage reached by research in the field a generation ago. An incidental result of the attention given to recent literature is that the notes become a guide to much of it. The value of this aspect of the treatment is enhanced by the critical bibliographical notes which occupy the concluding pages of the volume. The selective character of the bibliography and the scholarly estimates of the worth of the new and old literature which is included render it a highly useful tool. The whole effect is to bring out the bearing of many recent discoveries of detail upon the broader movements of the age.

The ultimate test of such a work is the extent to which the impressions conveyed to the reader are free from distortion. Generalization on such a scale often involves the extreme simplification of highly complicated evidence. The process almost invariably produces unintentional errors, and the present author has not entirely escaped the common fate. The mistakes which have come to my notice are questions of detail. An occasional state-

ment appears to be more categorical than the evidence warrants. Possibly "heresy all but disappeared from among clergy and people alike" in England by the middle of the fifteenth century (p. 226), but this conclusion is not universally accepted by students of the subject, and an exploration of the English episcopal registers which still repose in manuscript might overthrow it. Evidence which has been overlooked might have caused the qualification of some assertions. The acceptance of Adams's view that the representatives who met at Westminister in 1254 merely reported the actions of local assemblies (p. 99) makes the development of representation in England appear to be unduly late (Pasquet, *An Essay on the Origins of the House of Commons,* pp. 67-70; *Persecution and Liberty: Essays in Honor of George Lincoln Burr,* pp. 142-144), and the failure to note the possibility that Henry II may have convened a representative assembly in England as early as 1188 (*Facts and Factors in Economic History: Articles by former Students of Edwin Francis Gay,* pp. 71, 72) impairs somewhat the force of the claim that "chronologically speaking, Spain is 'the mother of parliaments' " (p. 73). Some of the few mistakes noted are insignificant. Though it is twice implied that the papacy made general levies of annates before 1306 (pp. 42, 43, 184), in neither instance does the implication affect the validity of the general conclusion with which it is associated. Indeed, the mature soundness of the author's historical judgment is nowhere displayed to better advantage than in the skill with which he has avoided both the pitfalls set for the unwary by some of his sources and the serious errors which the very nature of his task rendered it easy to make. Professor Cheyney has accomplished one of the most difficult tasks which the historian can undertake: he has characterized the life of a period with brevity, with charming simplicity and clarity of style, and without any serious sacrifice of the historical truth of which he has so long been the stanchest of exponents.

Haverford College. W. E. Lunt.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

A History of Europe. By H. A. L. Fisher, Warden of New College, Oxford. Volume II, *Renaissance, Reformation, Reason;* volume III, *The Liberal Experiment.* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1935; 1936. Pp. x, 435-810, xvii; xii, 811-1271, xviii. $4.00 each.)

In any general history above the purely informative level the selection and presentation of material weigh heavily in the reader's mind. To these volumes even the specialist may turn with some promise of profit, for Mr. Fisher reveals on the whole a fine sense of proportion combined with economy of statement. In his patient exposition of the history of Europe no credo is developed, and his refreshing faith in liberalism, democracy, and internationalism carries no bias. His survey, if anything, confirms a

belief in the painful hesitancy of social development through the ages.

The second volume covers the ground from the Renaissance to the French Revolution. How a society divided between lay and cleric gave way to one divided into rich and poor, and how an atmosphere hostile to free inquiry was supplanted by one in which science could live and mature, are the threads that one may trace through the author's account of the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the rise of Rationalism. The appearance of a new body of knowledge, wholly divorced from commentaries and glosses, and arising from wider geographical horizons and a closer interrogation of nature, had two important consequences. A cultural effulgence originating in Italy, the Renaissance, constituted one; the other was a challenge to the Church Universal and the Empire. Out of a prolonged struggle, in which ideals all but vanished, came Protestantism and the national state. Neither was a real solution, and Europe, as usual, had missed an opportunity. Still compensations were found in sectarianism, the bridge of faith, Calvinist virtue, Milton and Bach, and, for humble folk, the Bible and church music. National government was superior to feudal license, but it was also the spearhead of power politics, adaptable equally in dynastic, commercial, or imperialistic rivalries.

Political history receives its due share of attention in chapters dealing with the rise of the Dutch Republic, Spain and England, Mazarin, the English Revolution, Louis XIV, Sweden, Turkey, Russia, Prussia, and the wars of the eighteenth century. In treating the American Revolution, Mr. Fisher sees nothing outrageous in taxing colonists for colonial defense but condemns as folly the manner in which the ministry pursued the issue of taxation and adds that the conduct of the war was no less unfortunate than the policy which made war inevitable. French intervention, providential for America, was suicidal for Louis XVI because "the spectacle of republicanism triumphant and monarchy overthrown kindled in every forward-reaching mind in France the vision of a Europe remade after the new American pattern of republican liberty". The volume closes with the Industrial Revolution, whose advent Adam Smith saluted so exuberantly but whose results Marx was later to examine so pessimistically.

The final volume is devoted to the French Revolution, the nationalist movements, and the Great War and its aftermath. To show how civil, political, and religious freedom became firmly established in Britain, the Dominions, France, Holland, the Scandinavian countries, and the United States, is Mr. Fisher's task. From Mirabeau to Bismarck the narrative follows well-defined channels. Praiseworthy are policies calculated to benefit mankind, such as social amelioration and abolition of the slave traffic; stupid, the system whereby a few misguided men such as Bismarck, Gramont, Aehrenthal, Isvolski, and Berchtold could commit whole nations to slaughter. In assessing responsibility for the World War Mr. Fisher blames

Berchtold for persisting in punitive measures, Germany for not putting on the brakes, and Nicholas II for allowing his general staff to run away with him. In his epilogue, he adds: "The tragedy of the Great War was that it was fought between the most highly civilized peoples in Europe on an issue which a few level-headed men could easily have composed". Mr. Fisher reiterates (pp. 858, 1169, 1186) that when America joined the war she threw freedom of the seas to the winds, but he neglects to add that the ignoring of this question in 1919 stimulated the building of a navy capable of enforcing its rights in the future.

The substance of the peace treaties was dictated by "inexorable facts" which Clemenceau, Lloyd George, and Wilson were compelled to accept. Taking into consideration all their shortcomings, of which he is fully aware, Mr. Fisher praises the new political boundaries, "so drawn that three per cent only of the total population of the Continent live under alien rule". Of the League he says that "it offers the world as much world-government as the world can stand". As a historical philosopher who has faithfully accounted for many wasted generations of effort, Mr. Fisher expects but little of today. Yet he probably indulges the hopes so well expressed by Briand at the false Locarno: "Nous avons parlé européen. C'est une langue nouvelle qu'il faudra bien que l'on apprenne."

Princeton University. J. E. Pomfret.

Histoire des universités françaises et étrangères. Par Stephen d'Irsay. Tome II, *Du XVI^e siècle à 1860.* (Paris: Auguste Picard. 1935. Pp. vi, 451. 55 fr.)

This second volume of D'Irsay's magnum opus (the first, which appeared in 1933, was reviewed in this journal, XXXIX, 301-303) is unfortunately incomplete. His sudden and premature death in November, 1934, at the age of forty, brought the work to a close with 1860 instead of our own time and deprived us of the last six projected chapters—say 150 pages of text—which were to be devoted chiefly to the non-European universities, especially those of the United States, to relations with the great public, to the effects of the World War, and to conclusions forecasted in his first volume. The lack of a chapter on our universities is particularly regrettable, for D'Irsay came from Budapest to this country in 1921 and taught in several of our great medical schools, and his occasional "asides" indicate that he had something to say about our institutions of higher learning.

The promised bibliography and index are most praiseworthy. The former contains, the prefatory note tells us, in the neighborhood of four thousand titles, and each entry gives reference to the pages of both volumes in which it is cited. The bibliography is a modern mine of information on its subject. The index is analytical for persons, places, and subjects; it seems complete and accurate; and it enables the consultant to find, I had almost

said instantly, what he seeks, be it Aristotle, St. Thomas, or *droit des gens*. I know of no better index. It is the ultimate politeness of author to reader.

As in the first volume, the author traces the development of the universities under the impulsions of the ruling ideas of successive epochs: Cartesianism, Jansenism, Pietism, Newton and Locke, the *Aufklärung*, Romanticism, etc. Humanism plays a minor part in the period of the second volume; it continues to function chiefly through inertia. It is science that the author watches, from Padua, the great nursery of the sixteenth century, to Berlin, the master university achievement of the nineteenth century. Yet scientific investigation grew up, in the main, outside the universities, in royal societies, academies, institutes. The practical usefulness of science was its credential for admission to the universities, which long clung to the ideal that their task was to transmit organized knowledge rather than to attempt to increase the common stock.

The newer universities of the sixteenth century, especially Leiden and Edinburgh, win the author's respect by their initiative and realistic spirit. Vienna acquired its continuing renown under Maria Theresa. Göttingen, which opened its doors in 1737, was probably the leading university of its century, and with Halle took the first timid steps in the development of the seminary method which Berlin was to make its cornerstone. The French universities were not in touch with the intellectual movements of their time; they were slow to get the idea that research is a university function. The University of Paris was Peripatetic when Cartesianism was accepted elsewhere and Cartesian when the rest of the learned world followed Newton. The destruction of the French universities by the Revolution—"it is not scholars that we need, but free men worthy of freedom"—was followed by the Napoleonic Imperial University, the ill effects of which are not yet dissipated.

In his first volume D'Irsay noted that the governments of Europe had discovered in the fourteenth century that universities could be used to regiment opinion. They have never since forgotten it. But the democratic government of the Seven Provinces used its authority wisely and sparingly and contented itself, in the main, with securing the best professors in the world. I think that in his final chapter D'Irsay would have drawn a lesson from the Dutch example for our times.

The consideration of the greatness of the University of Berlin leads implicitly to three other conclusions, which I draw from D'Irsay's lines. First, a university worthy of the name combines intimately research and teaching; each fructifies the other. Secondly, a great university must have great scholars at the head of its faculties. Thirdly, the great university must maintain the conception of the universality and indivisibility of knowledge. And I am of the opinion that D'Irsay thought that the universities would continue

to be the centers of the intellectual life of our times, provided their freedom were safeguarded from without and wisely used within. That, rather than finance, is the great university problem of our difficult age.

The University of Wisconsin. G. C. SELLERY.

Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggio, Legate to the Courts of Henry VIII and Charles V. By EDWARD V. CARDINAL, Professor of History in St. Viator College. (Boston: Chapman and Grimes. 1935. Pp. 198. $2.50.)

IT is curious, when we consider the important part played by Cardinal Campeggio as well in the German as in the English Reformation, that someone has not written his biography long ago. And yet, apart from the eulogy of him published in 1586 by Carlo Sigonio in his *De episcopis bononiensibus* and such brief sketches as that of James Gairdner in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, there is virtually nothing. Dr. Cardinal's book is short and is confined pretty closely to the facts about Campeggio. And yet it represents a very considerable amount of research, not only in published documents, but also in the Vatican archives and in the Malvezzi-Campeggi archives in Bologna. It adds very little to what is already known about Campeggio and changes very little the established picture of him as set forth, for example, in Brewer's *Henry VIII*. For those who think of Campeggio simply in connection with the divorce of Catherine of Aragon, it will serve to disclose the fact that he played many parts and that his chief claim to remembrance lies rather in his efforts to stem the tide of Lutheranism in Germany than in his English adventure. Dr. Cardinal's book bears the imprimatur of the Roman church; it would be hard, however, to decide from the text on which side of the Reformation struggle his sympathies lie. Indeed, he has been so careful in his efforts to avoid religious bias that he fails to convey any real sense of the tremendous issues with which Campeggio undertook to deal. And he fails also to arouse any interest in his hero, fails to vitalize him. As for those great figures among whom Campeggio moved, Julius II, Henry VIII, Wolsey, Catherine of Aragon, Charles V, and the rest of them, they might as well be Mrs. Jarley's waxworks for all the flesh and blood that are in them. One wonders how, Dr. Cardinal's attachments being what they are, he could have failed to fall under the spell of Catherine of Aragon's splendid courage. It might have been better had he spent more time with his Shakespeare and less with his *documents inédits*. There is more to the writing of biography than a chronological arrangement of the ascertainable facts. Yet fact-finding is certainly the indispensable preliminary, and Dr. Cardinal has done that part of his task honestly and well.

The book is badly made—poor paper, poor presswork, extraordinarily careless proofreading. Honest scholarship deserves to go in better raiment.

The University of Pennsylvania. CONYERS READ.

Commons Debates, 1621. Edited by WALLACE NOTESTEIN, FRANCES HELEN RELF, and HARTLEY SIMPSON. Seven volumes. [Yale Historical Publications, Manuscripts and Edited Texts, XIV.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1935. Pp. xxiv, 343; 545; 473; 448; 534; 482; 656. $35.00.)

SELDOM if ever in the history of American scholarship has there appeared at one time a contribution so voluminous, so impressive, and so minutely edited as these seven volumes of Notestein, Relf, and Simpson. For a parallel one must go to such editions as those of the diaries of Pepys and Luttrell or such publications as those of the Carte Papers. In a sense even that parallel is not close, for in these handsome books, which reflect such credit on the skill of the Yale Press, there is embodied the work of many years of collection and many more of transcription, collating, comparison, and analysis, with painstaking assembling of statutes, cases, petitions, parliamentary precedents and grants, and a superlative in[illegible]x.

All this material relates to the proceedings of one Parliament, that of 1621-1622, sessions of which lasted from January 30 to June 30, 1621, and from November 20, 1621, to January 6, 1622, in all less than eight months. There is certainly no similar assembly in English history and perhaps none in any history, save that of the French Revolution, of which we have so detailed and minute account, nor does it seem probable that we shall ever have a more intimate picture of any Parliament than this, nor learn much more of this than may be gleaned from these pages.

The mere enumeration of the contents of these volumes reveals the store of information which they contain. Here, beginning with the "Anonymous Journal X", one of the more interesting of these documents, are the Barrington Diary, the Diary of John Pym, the diaries of John Smyth of Nibley, Sir Thomas Wentworth, Sir Nathaniel Rich, Sir Thomas Holland, the so-called "Z Diary", the "Book of Committees", the compilation known merely as "Rawlinson B 151", and finally the Commons Journal. The number and variety of these items indicate the wealth of the materials uncovered by patient and intelligent investigation, and one must envy Professor Notestein the great adventure of finding them, as one must congratulate him and his associates on their editorial achievements.

Most of all must one express appreciation of those who have spent on the elucidation of these diaries that meticulous care which we have been accustomed to associate with the editing of a newly discovered manuscript of the Gospels, a classical masterpiece, or one of Shakespeare's plays. The very language used to describe the "Anonymous Journal X" reveals the spirit in which this work was done. "It is not", say the editors, "the work of one man but is clearly a compilation . . . in the foreword we have mentioned five manuscripts of which we have made use in establishing the text. Other brief manuscripts, several of them, we have been at pains to consult but without significant result." The very description of the various manuscripts of this

diary—"MS. 1, MS. 2, MS. 3"—follows the same pattern. The methods by which these have been compared, collated, and discussed, as to sources, authenticity, relationships, methods of compilation, borrowing, and interpolation, is in the best tradition of the higher criticism and internal evidence on which the determination of a "definitive" text is built, and throughout these volumes the infinity of footnotes of variant readings, cross references to other manuscripts, are the last word in scholarly editing. It is impossible to conceive of greater care in textual method than these volumes reveal.

The introduction is of like character. It describes in minute detail the manuscripts themselves, their origin and authorship insofar as it is possible to determine them, the character of the manuscripts and of their authors, with such biographical, historical, and even verbal explanations as may serve to elucidate the text. The methods by which the contents of the third volume were determined to be the work of John Pym, partly by historical evidence and partly and more intimately by an almost incredibly minute comparison of words and phrases, is an extraordinary performance in itself.

But why, one may well ask, apart from the more general spirit of the scholar, which is such a mystery to so many outside of that esoteric group, why seven volumes on the Parliament of 1621, why such elaborate discussions of minutiae, such care in footnotes, such encyclopedic accuracy, such exacting pains in determining authorship, such tables of statutes and precedents, such enormous patience and industry? What is there in the proceedings of any legislative body to justify such expenditure of energy? The answer to that question is simple enough to the historian of English or even general affairs. In this Parliament of 1621 were threshed out the issues not only of the ensuing civil wars but those of later generations as to the form and function of parliamentary government, the rights and duties of the various elements of the state, executive, legislative, judicial, in peace and war, in civil and ecclesiastical affairs. It was the first time that the whole problem was brought into debate in English history, and to that long debate were summoned statute and precedent, fact and theory. The Parliament of 1621 was not, indeed, with all of this, so dramatic and spectacular as that of 1628, nor so earthshaking as that of 1640; but the debate there begun makes those of later Parliaments seem little more than echoes of these arguments.

To the elucidation of this Parliament the editors of these diaries have added much. For his account of its activities Professor Gardiner relied—besides the *Journal* and the *Proceedings and Debates,* the *State Papers* and the news letters of foreign ambassadors like Salvetti, Gondomar, and Tillières—on the lives and works of men like Bacon and Williams, order books and chancery proceedings, Elsing's *Notes,* the Strafford *Letters,* and like materials. Virtually none of the sources here presented was used by him, and that is perhaps the best comment on the value of this work. Little if any of its contents, in fact, has been published before, and it reveals, in consequence, a

whole new world of parliamentary history, in microcosm, as the seventeenth century would have said.

One thing it lacks, and one hopes that Professor Notestein may be spared to write what he, best of all men, is qualified to write—a historical introduction, comment and, in fact, history of this Parliament. It may be hoped, as well, that the materials collected by these editors on the later Parliaments may see the light of print, together with the transcriptions of other diaries, like that of D'Ewes, of which parts have been done by Professors Choate and Gray and Mrs. Gray, which are unfortunately still in manuscript. With the issue of these and their appropriate historical introductions, we may have in time a better view of that all-important quarter of a century of English history which lies between the summoning of this Parliament and the appeal to arms, and so, in some fashion, throw light not only on those times but on the great problem of representative government.

Harvard University. WILBUR C. ABBOTT.

The Deposition Books of Bristol. Volume I, *1643-1647.* Edited by H. E. NOTT, Archives Clerk to the Corporation. With an Introduction by JOSIAH GREEN, Town Clerk. [Bristol Record Society's Publications.] (Bristol: the University. 1935. Pp. xii, 307.)

THE eternal interest in the human side of history, so full of light and shade, makes these records of seventeenth century Bristol a most welcome contribution from the unpublished treasures in English municipal archives. Moreover, the period covered by this first volume of deposition books is one which was intensely alive both on land and sea. It was the time of civil war between Cavalier and Roundhead, when the best and worst in man defended and harried the country. While Charles I was fighting for his throne, Bristol first opened its gates to the forces of Parliament, then surrendered to Prince Rupert and the royalists, and two years later returned to its initial allegiance when Fairfax forced Rupert from the metropolis of the west.

These Bristol depositions, most ably edited by Miss Nott, are presented to the reader with a scholarly introduction from the pen of Mr. Green. Not only does he skim the cream from the documents but also adds much of interest and understanding from other unpublished records of Bristol, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum,* High Court of Admiralty cases, *Journals of the House of Commons,* and many other sources.

The records themselves, however, should be of great value to the local, economic, and political historian as well as to the student of the empire. They abound in genealogical information and aid much in the understanding of the topography of seventeenth century Bristol and its surroundings. They show the far-flung mercantile interests of the city at this time. They describe graphically the hazards of the sea filled with storms, pirates, and parliamentary men-of-war. In their tiny vessels, as many under as over one hundred

tons' burden, the merchants and mariners of Bristol, and other towns too, sought for wealth in all corners of the world. Tobacco and slaves, oil and wine, grain and hides, these depositions tell us, were carried hither and yon to run the gauntlet of the ferocity of nature and human greed.

But not alone on the sea did the inhabitants of Bristol encounter trouble at this time. The countryside of England was alive with plundering troopers who were attracted as quickly by a good horse as by money or goods. Then, too, for over a year during the first civil war the plague laid its burning hand on the unfortunate town. Sieges brought on starvation and death. Goods, property, and money were appropriated by both royalists and parliamentarians. And through it all the citizens of Bristol quarreled with each other, were assaulted and robbed, and failed to pay their just debts. Such topics and many more fill the pages of the deposition books. But so frequently they tantalize by recording only part of the whole story, as the great majority of the statements were taken for use in trials held in local and other courts whose records are hidden or no longer exist. On occasion, however, Mr. Green and Miss Nott give suggestions or present additional facts from other sources which help us to understand what these affidavits are all about.

Finally the volume closes with four most interesting and valuable appendixes, a bibliography, and a satisfactory index of persons and places.

New York University. HAROLD HULME.

Religion and Learning: a Study in English Presbyterian Thought from the Bartholomew Ejections, 1662, to the Foundation of the Unitarian Movement. By OLIVE M. GRIFFITHS. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. viii, 202. $4.50.)

THE transition from an orthodox to a liberal body is one of the most interesting phenomena of modern Protestant sectarianism. Explanations vary from a charge of moral depravity in the heretical innovators to the more impersonal suggestion of changes in the social environment. Miss Griffiths does not undertake a complete solution of the problem in her particular case but contents herself with giving merely the intellectual genealogy of the developed system. The Restoration religious settlement forced the English Presbyterians to reconsider their position. At the same time scientific research and Ramus's logic were breaking down the authority of Aristotle. In the Dutch universities, frequented by English Presbyterian students excluded from Anglican Oxford and Cambridge, the Calvinist reaction to Descartes involved the abandonment of the old doctrine of the superiority of the will to the intellect. In the Scotch institutions, similarly important for this study, reason was being exalted as the basis of morality. The result was that Arminianism, Arianism, and finally Socinianism made great inroads on the formerly orthodox body of English Presbyterians.

Nothing is more elusive than the source of an idea, and the reviewer may

perhaps be pardoned for raising an eyebrow here and there. Puritan students at Cambridge at the end of Elizabeth's reign—also a period of failure and re-evaluation for the Presbyterians—had read Ramus's work and shown a keen interest in natural science without turning Unitarian. The Dutch Voetians with whom the English studied did not produce especially unorthodox notions among their followers in Holland, and the Scotch idea of the relation of reason to the moral sense was not fully developed until the time of Priestley—too late for it to be called a formative influence. The author is on firmer ground, however, in her description of the later development of the new doctrines. And whether or not students of the field agree with her conclusion about the ancestry of English Unitarian ideas, they must be grateful to her for her guidance through the mazes of seventeenth century philosophy and theology. In particular, one must wholeheartedly endorse her insistence (p. 17) that "Calvinism was based on an interpretation of the Universe which exalted sentiment and emotion" as against cold reason. The point has been made before, but her detailed demonstration (pp. 54-67) deserves careful reading. Old legends die hard.

The University of Chicago. M. M. KNAPPEN.

Samuel Pepys: the Years of Peril. By ARTHUR BRYANT. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. xv, 466. $3.50.)

MR. Arthur Bryant is a brilliant young Englishman who, at the age of thirty-seven, has to his credit some excellent work in history. He has produced at least eight books since 1929—some merely essays or lectures, others solid, scholarly, like the work under review, which is the fruit of industrious research and by far his best book to date. It constitutes volume two of a three-volume life of Pepys, which will be the first full-length biography of the great diarist. The world has long known him only between the ages of twenty-seven and thirty-six, when he wrote the most famous of diaries. With its close, the first volume ends. The present volume covers 1669-1683. The next, which will be subtitled "The Saviour of the Navy", will conclude the work.

Volume two deals with a period in the life of Pepys that was more serious than that of the diary years. His amours occupy less space and are less distracting to the reader as, presumably, to Samuel himself. But other sides of his private life are still much emphasized. Most of the volume is as interesting as volume one, which, considering the absence of the diary, represents no mean accomplishment on the part of the author. There is no question but that Mr. Bryant can write interesting history in entertaining English.

Two chief subjects fill the volume: the navy and the Popish Plot. The book contributes much that is new in regard to both. Pepys's importance to the navy during this period, like his importance to everything else all the time, is undoubtedly overemphasized. The record of his efforts at efficiency

would be impressive enough—and probably more correct—without so many superlatives. For Mr. Bryant is no restrained historian. He not only suffers from the hero worship common to most biographers when not prefacing their biographical study by long and thorough grounding in the history of the period, but he continues his earlier habit of hurling unsupported Tory invectives against Whig opponents in the same unmeasured language for which he criticizes them. The work is in a different class from his apologetic *Charles II* (1931), but it is obviously by the same author. In spite of his several books in the field, he is not satisfactorily abreast of recent contributions. There is more thorough use of sources than of secondary material, with the result that his facts are often more impressive than his interpretations.

Pepys's perilous situation during 1678-1681, when he suffered with his chief patron, the Duke of York, is presented with great and interesting detail. The author's Tory imagination is hard on Shaftesbury, and the reader must guard against thinking that Mr. Bryant has solved the enigma of Godfrey's death, which remains as enigmatic as ever. These chapters are not very important as regards the Plot, but very important as regards Pepys. Their story has never been known or told before. It is the most important part of the two volumes.

The volume contains seven good illustrations, and appendixes on Pepys's many ailments. Most of the references are grouped by paragraphs at the end of the book, but there are many footnotes in connexion with quotations in the text, and others containing quotations and explanations. The only excuse for relegating such matter to the end of a volume is gone if there must still be some of it at the foot of the page, which is actually the only place where it will be much used.

Mr. Bryant has mastered the plentiful manuscript material in the Bodleian and at Magdalene on Pepys's later career. Scores of books on Pepys have appeared in the last twenty years, but none approaches this in size, thoroughness, and importance. The best work on Pepys, however, is of minor interest compared to the *Diary* itself, which will soon appear in its first complete form.

Northwestern University. CLYDE L. GROSE.

Robespierre: Die Tragödie des politischen Ideologen. Von PETER RICHARD ROHDEN. (Berlin: Halle Verlag. 1935. Pp. 519.)

THERE have been a number of recent biographies of Robespierre. In addition to this one, there are lives by J. M. Thompson and by G. J. Renier, and at least one other life of Robespierre is in preparation in English. The time was indeed apt. Albert Mathiez and his aides had worked industriously and uncovered much new material. But the master was quite incapable of critical detachment towards Robespierre, incapable, indeed, of seeing him as a living human being, and hence incapable of writing his life. There was no satisfactory life of Robespierre in any language. Hamel was shockingly

one-sided, long, and shapeless. Hilaire Belloc's *Life* was interesting, and, as one ought to expect, eccentric. Béraud's *Mon ami Robespierre* was suspiciously like other *biographies romancées* and a better study of the twentieth century *petit bourgeois* than of the Incorruptible himself.

Dr. Rohden's book admirably fills that need for a good single-volume life of Robespierre, and one wishes that the state of the book trade would permit its translation into English. Dr. Rohden in his preface insists that he has not written a biography in the ordinary sense, certainly not one of the modern type "deren Verfasser den Anspruch erheben, über das Inneleben ihres Helden bis in die letzten Schlupfwinkel der Seele Bescheid zu wissen"; he has sought merely to fit Robespierre into the whole course of the revolutionary torment, to understand him as a *politique et moraliste*. Yet he has certainly succeeded in making Robespierre as a human being more real and convincing than some more intimate biographers. The chapter entitled "Robespierre in Pantoffeln" is written with a good deal of insight and fairness.

Dr. Rohden does not think Robespierre a great statesman. As his subtitle indicates, he finds in Robespierre one type of the man of words, the political "idealist" or *"idéologue"*, who by his persistent repetition of certain simple political ideas, by rhetorical gifts essentially like those of the preacher, contrives to symbolize a cause and to attain to apparent leadership. Yet he certainly does not oversimplify the Incorruptible, and his book is sufficiently long and sufficiently detailed to permit him to trace the complicated interactions between Robespierre as a person and the hundreds of other wills and other ideas which made up the revolutionary milieu. In the course of his story Dr. Rohden has some excellent passages on the Gironde and the Mountain, on the nature of the Jacobin dictatorship (Die Diktatur ohne Diktator), on the religious policy of the Jacobins. Indeed, the book is in many ways one of the best short histories of the Revolution (up to Thermidor) available. Nor, though it avoids the traps of the "new biography", is it lacking in dramatic interest and readability.

The introduction is perhaps the most original and most useful part of the book. It affords a brief review of the history of Robespierre's reputation (certainly not elsewhere available), a penetrating criticism of Mathiez and his Société d'Études Robespierristes, and a very sensible refusal to follow certain false leads offered by psychiatry in the study of Robespierre. Dr. Rohden sees a political implication in the work of Mathiez (this book would, by the way, have infuriated the master to the point of apoplexy had he lived to read it) but concludes: "Um politische Wirkungen zu zeitigen, kam der Versuch, den Unbestechlichen zu rehabilitieren, eben zu spät. Denn der moderne Revolutionär kann von Robespierre höchstens taktisch noch etwas lernen. . . . So ist der Dantonist Aulard der letzte Historiker der Revolution geblieben, hinter dessen Darstellung lebendige politische Kräfte stehen, während der Robespierre-Kult der Mathiez-Gruppe nicht über den Bezirk der Fachwissenschaft hinausgelängt ist" (p. 36).

This last is such eminent good sense that one hopes it may have an echo even in France. The French are reputed, probably with good reason, to have a peculiar fondness for disputes over ideas; but even in France, dispute does not commonly go on forever over *dead* ideas. One of the virtues of Dr. Rohden's book is that it makes clear how much of the French Revolution is now really past, how much of it has joined that pleasantly immortal world about which only historians and literary critics commonly dispute. This is a service which much longer and heavier tomes have not yet rendered.

Harvard University. CRANE BRINTON.

Saint-Just, Colleague of Robespierre. By EUGENE NEWTON CURTIS, Professor of History, Goucher College. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1935. Pp. xi, 402. $3.50.)

PROFESSOR Curtis has written a notable biography of Saint-Just. More compressed than the older volumes of Fleury or Hamel, it is also far superior in scholarship and objectivity. He has checked the details and documents uncovered by Vellay, Dommanget, Laurent, and others, during the last thirty years, supplemented them by his own researches into the life of the young *conventionnel,* and produced a full-length study so scrupulously documented that it may be accepted as establishing all the ascertainable facts concerning Saint-Just's brief career.

The figure which emerges, though more substantial than the apocalyptic youth of romantic tradition, is scarcely less enigmatic or less incredible. Saint-Just still claims his immortality "in the centuries and in the skies", and his latest biographer has humanized rather than deflated the legend. Mr. Curtis displays a mastery of his material which renders his judgments all but unassailable, and his estimate of the influence which the young "Colleague of Robespierre" wielded in the Convention, in the Committee of Public Safety, and on the battlefield, may necessitate a revaluation of Saint-Just's role in the revolutionary drama. Those who are still inclined, like the present reviewer, to regard Saint-Just as more of a *poseur* than a politician, to consider his speeches as party rather than personal triumphs, and to concur with the military historians in disparaging his essays at generalship, may well find themselves reduced to a minority.

But however the debate may range around such value judgments, there can be no dispute concerning the thoroughness with which Mr. Curtis has garnered and sifted the records of Saint-Just's career. His share in drafting the Constitution of 1793, his responsibility in directing the Terror, his duties on the Committee of Public Safety and in the Bureau of General Police, have been established through a scrutiny of the minutes, decrees, and dispatches which must command the profoundest admiration. Mr. Curtis deserves the gratitude of all investigators in this field of study, and the casual reader will likewise bless him for combining such careful scholarship with a flexible and pleasing style.

The possibility of casual error has been all but eliminated by the exemplary proof reading. It seems almost captious to suggest that "Plato's *Utopia*" (p. 4) might have been changed to Plato's *Republic* for the sake of the literal-minded. Étienne Mollevaut, the Girondist, is cited in the unfamiliar form Mollevault (p. 87). The statement (p. 349) that Saint-Just's detention for his theft of the family silver was unknown to Fleury or Hamel is incorrect. Fleury had heard of it but lacked the proof. Hamel planned as early as 1870 to incorporate the episode in a third edition of his *Saint-Just,* which unhappily he never issued. He published the relevant documents, together with an apology for his original skepticism, in 1897 (*La Révolution française,* XXXII, 97-120).

Two likenesses of Saint-Just, and two maps, add to the value and utility of this biography. The notes, bibliography, and index leave nothing to be desired, and the format is most attractive.

New York University. GEOFFREY BRUUN.

Napoléon. Par GEORGES LEFEBVRE, maître de conférences à la Faculté des lettres de Paris. [Peuples et civilisations, Histoire générale, publiée sous la direction de Louis Halphen et Philippe Sagnac.] (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1935. Pp. 606. 60 fr.)

THIS volume has abundant warrant for existence apart from covering an epoch in an excellent general history. It challenges comparison with corresponding volumes in the Lavisse and Rambaud series and in the *Cambridge Modern History.* While twenty writers contributed to the former and sixteen to the latter, this is the production of a single scholar. In length the two older works each contained 365,000 words; this volume runs to only 265,000. The treatment in Lavisse and Rambaud is mainly topical, as only ten of the thirty chapters are devoted to the chronological narrative. The *Cambridge Modern History* volume emphasizes the chronological narrative, which requires fourteen chapters, while the remaining ten are essentially parts of the narrative separately treated to secure continuity. This volume more nearly resembles the latter as twelve chapters recount the main story while seven are primarily topical but neatly welded into the narrative. On extra-European areas the *Cambridge Modern History* has a single chapter, and Lavisse and Rambaud has two; the present writer has no separate chapter but skillfully incorporates numerous items at the appropriate places in the main account. Professor Lefebvre's volume also suggests comparison with the corresponding contributions of Professor Pariset and M. Madelin to recent serial histories of France. The basic difference is that these two earlier works were written as contributions to French history, while Lefebvre's task is to present the European or world view of the period. No one of the five works is a life of Napoleon, but while Madelin yielded much to the interest of the dominating personality, Lefebvre has steeled himself against that fascination and, more-

over, has throughout depicted the Tsar Alexander as the rival predestined to win. Obviously the series to which the author contributes has some effect on his presentation. In method and technique the present work most resembles Pariset's.

Lefebvre's excellent bibliographies reveal unusual familiarity with the latest researches in every country. Professor Lefebvre has compacted a vast range of items into a minimum space—every possible topic and person gets an appropriate niche. This heroic condensation has produced a style clear, logical, and precise, but excessively succinct and overcrowded—a dozen lines suffice for the battle of Austerlitz. There are, however, compensations. Valuable information, otherwise not easily accessible, appears on many subjects. The two introductory chapters on the ideas and the problems of 1799 are masterpieces. The reviewer knows no work on the period comparable in comprehensiveness, breadth, discrimination, balance, and unity.

Wesleyan University. GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER.

Napoléon et Talleyrand. Par ÉMILE DARD. (Paris: Librairie Plon. 1935. Pp. xx, 420. 30 fr.)

BEGINNING with the volumes of Charles Dupuis and culminating in those of Lacour-Gayet, recent years have witnessed a revival of interest in Talleyrand. Significant, though unfortunately diffused, additions have been made to published documents, and Caulaincourt's memoirs have revealed valuable information. Now M. Dard, who has previously written works on Choderlos de Laclos and Hérault de Séchelles, brings a new interpretation with a modicum of new materials.

The introduction is a skillful, some might say brilliant, presentation of the author's thesis that Talleyrand's policy from 1792 onward was consistently devoted to assuring France internal order and its natural frontiers and to establishing European peace based on a Franco-Austrian alliance. The ensuing exposition of the relations between Napoleon and Talleyrand leaves the impression—perhaps unfair—of a cinema scenario rather than of a consistently thorough and impartial presentation of the evidence. Yet it is a good story well and plausibly narrated with incessant regard for the supporting evidence. The reader is, however, frequently left wondering whether he is getting the whole story and all the evidence. The story fits the thesis too perfectly, and the author seems overinsistent that his thesis fits the facts. The essential point of the thesis—the consistency of Talleyrand's career—is not new; its elaboration, however, is a definite contribution, even if not a convincing demonstration.

M. Dard admits some admiration for Napoleon but more or less subtly discredits him. Talleyrand is the hero of his book, though, he admits even on the false titlepage—a devil of a hero. Several times he insinuates a parallelism of Talleyrand with Mirabeau. Gradually the reader becomes aware

that beneath the pleasant surface of the volume there is a deadly undertow. The emperor and the minister are the murderers of the Duc d'Enghien and the despoilers of the Spanish Bourbons. They are, respectively, the most dangerous criminal and the most precious scoundrel of the age, mutually indispensable, mutually incompatible, alternately undercutting one another. The Corsican, though the greatest genius in centuries, is a parvenu and the child of the Revolution—hence unpardonable. The descendant of the Perigords is a monarchist whose nobility antedates Capetian royalty, and he has bon ton—his crimes and rascality may be condoned. So it is not Talleyrand the individual but Talleyrand the representative of the old nobility and of the monarchist traditions who is the real hero. This is avowed in the closing pages which are a tawdry bit of royalist journalism. A useful book is deliberately spoiled to point a partisan argument.

Wesleyan University. GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER.

Bernadotte and the Fall of Napoleon. By FRANKLIN D. SCOTT. [Harvard Historical Monographs, VII.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1935. Pp. 190. $1.50.)

WHEN the Swedes chose Bernadotte, the Gascon soldier and Napoleonic prince, to succeed their childless King Carl XIII, they did so in anticipation of an alliance with Bonaparte and the eventual recovery of Finland. Invested as crown prince, Bernadotte was quick to observe the unfeasibility of such an alliance, but at the same time he realized that his own political future would depend upon his service to Swedish national aims. Accordingly, instead of attempting to wrest Finland from Russia, he decided to take Norway from the Danes, and turned for help to the group of nations that remained hostile to France.

In six of his seven chapters Dr. Scott relates the tangled diplomacy into which Bernadotte was necessarily thrown. He tells how the crown prince forged alliances with Britain and the Continental powers; how he maintained these alliances despite the armistice of 1813, the perfidies of Albion, and the inconstancy of Russia and Austria; and how he finally won his prize, Norway, only by lending Swedish arms to the allied attack on Paris.

One must praise unqualifiedly the documentation of the work. Dr. Scott, who uses at least five languages, has drained the archives of Sweden, Denmark, Prussia, Austria, France, and England of relevant materials, and has drawn therefrom the labyrinthine diplomatic detail of his difficult subject. His researches reveal a great deal of new material on the complicated background of Sweden's acquisition of Norway, as well as the role of Sweden in the last allied drive on Napoleon.

But the book is not deserving of unstinted praise. In the first place, this reviewer would question the appropriateness of the title, for the work seems

to him primarily an account of how the Swedes won the right to take Norway, and quite secondarily how they contributed to the fall of Napoleon. In the second place, the author's very obvious compression of a long book into a short one has been achieved by suppressing all the non-political factors of diplomacy. The result is a rather specialized and barren sort of history in which communications between chancelleries and conversations among plenipotentiaries are stressed to the exclusion of underlying social and economic forces. In the third place, where Dr. Scott has made scrupulous use of detail in the interest of historical exactitude, his overconscientious and unnecessary mention of the names of officials and places has frequently served to obscure his meaning without advancing his narrative.

Yale University. SHERMAN KENT.

International Economics and Diplomacy in the Near East: a Study of British Commercial Policy in the Levant, 1834-1853. By VERNON JOHN PURYEAR, Fellow of the Social Science Research Council, 1930-1931. With a Foreword by ROBERT J. KERNER. (Stanford University: Stanford University Press. 1935. Pp. xiii, 264. $3.25.)

IN this volume Professor Puryear treats essentially of the economic background of the Crimean War. More specifically, the book deals with (1) the development of Anglo-Russian political rivalry between 1834 and 1838, leading to the crisis of 1838-1839, (2) the establishment of virtual free trade in Turkey, 1838-1839, and the negotiation of the Anglo-Turkish Commercial Convention of 1838, (3) the Turco-Egyptian War of 1839-1841 (Mehemet Ali) and the closure of the Straits to foreign warships by the Straits Convention of 1841, (4) the powers and the Near Eastern grain trade, 1840-1853, and (5) British commercial policy and the Crimean War. The author declares that "the international document which more than any other regulated the subsequent European commercial intercourse with Turkey was the Anglo-Turkish Commercial Convention [Balta Liman] of 1838. About this agreement, and the conditions which attended it, revolved the commercial history of the Near East for the period which preceded the Crimean War."

Taking as his background the increasing industrialization of Great Britain under the commercial policy of free trade, Mr. Puryear draws some interesting conclusions concerning Great Britain's relation to the Near Eastern question in the mid-nineteenth century. The Near East, he reminds the reader, was one of the principal regions for British overseas economic expansion, and it became a source of grain supplies for Great Britain. It was also a new link in the communications with India—the route through Egypt was now clearly recognized. As her political influence and economic interest in the Near East increased, Great Britain would be prepared to meet

the challenge of Imperial Russia in Asia. Finally, the author points out that "an extensive and perhaps unjustifiable economic and political competition" developed between Russia and England in the Near and Middle East. Co-operation was thus precluded. "British support of Turkey postponed the solution of the Near Eastern Question, providing one of the darkest blots in the nineteenth-century diplomatic history of Europe". By the outbreak of the Crimean War the British possessed a well-defined commercial and economic policy in the Near East. It was combined with a political policy which sought the preservation of the European balance and attempted to use Turkey as a buffer state for the defense of India. This policy depended upon the maintenance of the Ottoman state and was a primary factor leading to the Crimean War.

To this reviewer the most interesting portions of the book are those which portray the making of the Anglo-Turkish Convention of 1838, the economic development of southern Russia and the rise of Odessa as a Black Sea port, the competition between the Danubian Principalities and southern Russia, and the rivalry of the powers over the Near Eastern grain trade in the years preceding the Crimean War.

The volume is well written, objective, and substantial. It is based on a wide use of materials from the British, German, French, and Austrian archives. There is an excellent bibliography, which should serve as a useful guide to all students interested in this period of Near Eastern history. As Professor Kerner has remarked in his foreword: "The economic background of the Crimean War has received its first thorough analysis." Mr. Puryear's volume should become a fitting companion to his standard work on *England, Russia, and the Straits Question, 1844-1856.*

Miami University. HARRY N. HOWARD.

Realism and Nationalism, 1852-1871. By ROBERT C. BINKLEY, Western Reserve University. [The Rise of Modern Europe, edited by William L. Langer.] (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1935. Pp. xx, 337. $3.75.)

THIS is an interesting account of two decades during which, the author states, "on all fronts the way was cleared for a generation of materialism". The work fulfills one of the purposes of the series of which it is a part in that it synthesizes contributions made by a large number of monographs.

In the introductory chapters the author gives an account of science, literature and art, and the church, which reflects considerable energy in compilation. He analyzes the new scientific attitudes of both the technician and the public and shows the applications of the new science, especially to industry and medicine. A maze of facts is crowded into a stimulating narrative, which is not, however, chronological. The breadth of the introductory treatment is suggested by the inclusion of discussions of how national armies came to

enjoy a special position in the state, of the shifts from romanticism to realism in literature and to realism and impressionism in pictoral art, and of the end of direct collaboration between the church and state by 1870.

Two chapters (pp. 72-124) cover economic matters. The topics include overseas migrations, shifts to the cities, the end of serfdom in Russia, the movements toward free trade and a money economy, the extension of corporate enterprise, and the philosophies (especially that of John Stuart Mill) back of many of the economic changes. In a few instances economic matters are less effectively presented than are other factors. The *Zollverein* (pp. 100, 186, 274) is inadequately treated (as to its part in German political unification); the figures for railway mileage given on p. 17 would seem to show that "the main thread of economic history" (p. 94) should include transportation. The international grain markets and the beginnings of an international price might have been mentioned.

The not-too-detailed account of the more usual political and military history for the period of Cavour and Bismarck begins with a chapter which analyzes the results of the revolutions of 1848. The reaction is illustrated by the centralizing of the governing process, the application of the Bach system in Austria, and the new omnipotence of the territorial state. Two chapters (IX and XI) deal with "federative polity" (which is described "as opposite in its implications to such concepts as 'sovereignty' and 'power' "). Other topics include: the Crimean War (which is well summarized); federative experiments in 1857-1858; confederation and unity in Italy (especially well written); the political changes within Austria-Hungary; and the Prussian wars for German unification. The latter are treated under the chapter headings of "Civil War and Reconstruction" and "Dénouement". The attitude is rather sympathetic to Napoleon III (pp. 260, 304), and somewhat unfriendly to Bismarck (pp. 270, 305).

This reviewer has the impression that the author considers the European concert, whether as regards "the disturbance of [its] equilibrium" (p. 181), or as regards its "authority" (p. 182), as a functioning organism in general. This impression is strengthened by such phrases as "the constitution of Europe" (p. 164), "the authority of Europe" (p. 179), "the principle of all-European action" (p. 180), "Europe's federative structure" (p. 181), "the disintegration of international authority" (p. 214), and "the era of European disintegration" (p. 263). Perhaps the enthusiasm of the writer for his subject, or the obvious necessity for condensation, is responsible for these terms. Actually, the various congresses of the nineteenth century were definitely limited in their results if not in the scope of their discussions, while the "concert" was rather a convenient diplomatic term than the name of an entity which had any authority (as the author shows in his quotation from Russell, p. 260) except insofar as treaties had provided for international

action in specific contingencies, or except when working arrangements were devised between certain of the powers for quite specific purposes. Indeed, "balance" rather than "concert" would perhaps more properly summarize the rather constant realignments of the powers for the achievement of their specific objectives.

The treatment is of Europe as a whole. There is a satisfactory balance in the allotment of space to the various powers and to internal and international affairs. Problems for consideration are suggested for each epoch. The "confederative program" (p. 216) and "dualism" broadly interpreted (p. 230) are examples. Mr. Binkley has not neglected occasional references to important contemporary developments outside of Europe; there is even a reference to Ethiopia (p. 283). A selection of sixty engravings is included. The work closes with a good bibliographical essay. It is substantial and a valuable addition to the reference literature for nineteenth century Europe.

Humboldt State College. VERNON J. PURYEAR.

Die auswärtige Politik Preussens 1858-1871. Abteilung II. Band V, *April 1864 bis April 1865, mit einem Anhang zur Zollvereinspolitik Juli 1863 bis April 1864.* Bearbeitet von Dr. RUDOLF IBBEKEN. [Diplomatische Aktenstücke herausgegeben von der Historischen Reichskommission unter kommissarischer Leitung von Willy Hoppe.] (Oldenburg i. O.: Gerhard Stalling. 1935. Pp. 837.)

IN order to give a well-rounded picture of Prussian foreign policy, a large number of documents that were already accessible in Bismarck's *Gesammelten Werke* and other well-known collections were included in the early volumes of this series. But as it has remained necessary for scholars to continue to consult those collections, it has been announced by the Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands, which has superseded the Historische Reichskommission, that only documents for which no satisfactory text is available in print shall be reproduced in full in the succeeding volumes (see A. O. Meyer's review article in the *Historische Zeitschrift,* CLIII, 325). Of the 554 principal documents in the present volume from the archives of Berlin, Vienna, London, Moscow, and Stockholm, about 190, including many of the more interesting, have been published before. For French sources, reference is made to the *Origines diplomatiques de la guerre de 1870-1871.* Italian documents, even in abstract, are omitted although the long-promised Italian collection has not yet appeared. The archives of the lesser German states, too, have been disregarded but are to be used for the following period. The editing follows the plan laid down for the series and is generally of high quality. The editor has failed to note the previous publication of some of the documents, especially Rechberg's private letters to Bismarck on the *Zollverein* negotiations which were published from the Rechberg papers in

the *Oesterreichische Rundschau,* XLIII (1915), 197-209. There are a few misprints.

The first part of the volume deals with the London Conference and the making of peace with Denmark. There is a brief interlude when the negotiations over Austria's relation to the *Zollverein* are in the foreground. This episode culminates in the fall of Rechberg. Austria then takes up the problem of the disposition of the duchies ceded by the king of Denmark and the volume ends with the first climax of the Austro-Prussian conflict over Schleswig-Holstein: the rejection by Austria of the Prussian "February conditions" and the passage, with Austrian approval, of the Bavarian-Saxon motion at the Diet in favor of the Augustenburg candidacy. The Schleswig-Holstein question is the main subject of discussion, as it changes from a subject of general European interest to one purely German. There is incidental material on the *Zollverein* negotiations, on the Franco-Italian "September convention" for the evacuation of Rome, and on the attitude of the powers towards the Eastern Question in general and the question of the dedicated convents in the Danubian principalities in particular.

Much of the material here printed has been used by the reviewer in the *Schleswig-Holstein Question,* by C. W. Clark in *Franz Joseph and Bismarck,* and by E. Franz in *Der Entscheidungskampf um die wirtschaftspolitische Führung Deutschlands,* to mention only a few recent studies. The full texts of many unpublished, though used, documents gives both a more detailed and vivid view of the negotiations and a check on the previous use of the sources. The Russian materials are new and, by supplementing the French and Austrian reports on Bismarck, fill out the picture of his tactics towards the three powers that were of the greatest significance in the shaping of Prussian policy. The policy of Russia was critical but pro-Prussian. "Je trouve la langage de Bismarck peu rassurant", was Alexander's comment on Oubril's report of April 14/24, 1864, in which Bismarck began to disclose his desire to secure the duchies for Prussia (no. 5). Russia feared that the dismemberment of Denmark might lead to a Scandinavian union and was determined not to allow the Belts and the Sound to become a second Bosphorus. But Russia's primary interest was in the Near East, where she desired to maintain the harmony of the other powers in opposition to Napoleon III (*e.g.,* nos. 49, 87, 97, 104). Russia was useful to Bismarck in supporting the candidacy of the Duke of Oldenburg against the Prince of Augustenburg (pp. 134, 164, 166, 168, 177, 185-186, and *passim*). In the Eastern Question Bismarck was less useful to Russia. Now, as later, he kept Prussia in the background. The study of Bismarck's conversations with the Russian and Austrian envoys is especially interesting. As the negotiations continued in the late fall of 1864, Bismarck began to complain more and more bitterly to the Russians of his grievances against Austria, though the

expressions of indignation did not reach the intensity of the period after the *Fürstentag* of 1863 (nos. 346, 354, and *passim*). Bismarck's conversations are usually not to be taken without salt, but they are precious contributions to our understanding of his tactics and policy.

The University of Minnesota. LAWRENCE D. STEEFEL.

Disraeli, Gladstone, and the Eastern Question: a Study in Diplomacy and Party Politics. By R. W. SETON-WATSON, Masaryk Professor of Central European History in the University of London. [Studies in Modern History, General Editor, L. B. Namier.] (New York: Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. xv, 590. $7.00.)

IN this study, an outgrowth of a series of lectures, Professor Seton-Watson has made a distinct contribution to our knowledge of the Balkan crisis of the 1870's. The significance of the work arises partly from the author's good fortune in obtaining access to a mass of unpublished and previously unexplored Russian papers, partly from the meticulous care with which he has examined almost every aspect of the European situation. Thus an essentially accurate reconstruction of the European scene has been arrived at, and the student of diplomacy now can see, doubtless with greater clarity than did the participants themselves, the successive stages of development of a major European imbroglio from the Bosnian insurrection and the British purchase of the Suez Canal shares to the partial settlement supplied by the Congress of Berlin.

Much of the story detailed here of course is not new. Perhaps its outstanding achievement is the series of admirable studies of the principals who formulated the conflicting policies of the time and competed with each other at home and abroad for power and leadership. It is conclusively shown, for example, that "Disraeli as a master of foreign policy belongs to the myths of history". Although Gladstone may have been treated somewhat overgenerously, Queen Victoria, Derby, Salisbury, Layard, Andrássy, Bismarck, Shuvalov, and others are vividly portrayed and accurately measured with reference both to English domestic politics and to the ramifications of the Eastern Question.

Notwithstanding the author's frankly British viewpoint and his occasional lapses from objectivity (pp. 26, 38, 73, *et passim*), his estimates of forces, factors, and resultants will generally be regarded as sound. His account of the reaction of public sentiment in England to the Bulgarian atrocities is noteworthy, as is his demonstration of the general ineptitude of Russian foreign policy and his delineation of the flimsy character of British policy with respect to Turkey. Adverting to the convention with Turkey of June 4, 1878, he remarks appropriately that "Cyprus was the sop to Cerberus which averted any too close or critical inspection of the platter from which it had been flung". In this connection he confirms the recent view that Egypt

escaped being seized as an eastern base principally because of the belief that France would not stand for such an act. Commendable, also, is his account of the way in which "the Dual Alliance was the direct outcome of the Russo-German misunderstanding after the Congress, which in its turn was materially influenced by the manner in which British opinion greeted the settlement as a notable discomfiture of Russia".

The book, however, is decidedly overlong. Quoted extracts from notes and conversations often supply telling illustrations, clarify points of view, and add local color, but a volume constructed as this is, so largely of source quotations, can scarcely avoid being deficient in other architectural values. Also it is very doubtful that the "confrontation" of Disraeli, Derby, Salisbury, and Gladstone in the epilogue contributes materially to the book. In place of this review of the mutual relationships of the outstanding English political figures of the time, who have been well and adequately treated previously in the book, the reviewer would wish to find a synthesis of the fundamental interests which lay at the bottom of the diplomatic maneuvers of the period. The complicated problems of these years, so conscientiously detailed in the volume, call for a more comprehensive view than is afforded by the observation (p. 421) that "the history of the Eastern crisis is an object lesson in the infinite complications and eventual futility of ultra-secretive methods".

Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. HALFORD L. HOSKINS.

The Diplomacy of Imperialism, 1890–1902. By WILLIAM L. LANGER, Harvard University. Two volumes. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1935. Pp. xvii, 414; xi, 415-797, xxii. $7.50.)

THE two new volumes of Professor Langer's great survey of European diplomacy have an added distinction, though they have lost nothing of the inspired usefulness of their predecessor. The task of the historian in the period that followed Bismarck is Bismarckian in its complexity. He must see the situation through the eyes not of one foreign office but of many, for Paris, St. Petersburgh, Vienna, Berlin, and London are in turn the center of the diplomatic world. Nor is this the only difficulty. He must change his focus even more often, as the issues with which diplomacy is concerned shift from one locality to another. Professor Langer has put all students of the period deeply in his debt. He has given them a coherent picture of European relations, its lines firmly drawn, despite the wealth of detail, its diplomatic foreground in the proper political and economic setting.

The title of these volumes—though perhaps the author is less happy in his titles than in his treatment of his subject—gives first place to the stretching out of European powers to the world beyond their frontiers. Diplomacy was changing from the predominantly European outlook of the Bismarckian period and was becoming increasingly perceptive of non-European issues. The fall of Bismarck left Germany still the center of the diplomatic system.

The formation of the Franco-Russian Alliance—the subject of the first two chapters—preludes the destruction of this unity. These chapters are well worth study even for those who are familiar with Professor Langer's earlier monograph, for there is fresh material here from Russian sources, and in the course of the narrative we get many hints of the way European diplomacy was shaping. The "flirt Anglo-Triplicien", and its influence on Franco-Russian relations, the discussions of the Rosebery period concerning the Straits question—the emphasis on these points prepares us for the central place assigned to British policy in the later part of the book. The greatest colonial power was about to step from her position in the wings to the center of the stage.

When we leave the formation of the Franco-Russian Alliance and before we pass to the kaleidoscopic period of the middle nineties, we find an interesting and rigidly impartial analysis of the imperialist force to which so much importance is attached. This definition of imperialism, valuable though it is, is probably the least definitive section of the book. It gives the movement a greater appearance of self-consciousness than a fuller story would probably confirm. The explanation is to be found in the enforced limitation of the sources. Commentators on colonial expansion and writers of polemical literature must continue to dominate the historian of expansionist movements until the day by day activities of the man on the spot and of the administrator at home can be pieced together from archives at present closed. On the British side, for example, Parliamentary Papers are valuable for information on events, but on this subject, as on others, such publications record decisions rather than policy. An examination of the colonial office papers of the eighties suggests that the departmental minutes—very rarely reproduced in Parliamentary Papers—are an important source for a study of colonial affairs. For Professor Langer's period, however, these papers are not yet accessible, and in face of this limitation of his sources he shows courage and discrimination in his analysis.

The imperial factor is found immediately at work in Africa. The French and German protests against the Congo Treaty might be dismissed, indeed, as unimportant if we considered them from the point of view merely of Franco-German co-operation. The alignment was a temporary one, and can be grouped with other temporary associations of the period—such as the Armenian Triplice, "at bottom a farce" (p. 167), and the combination of Russia, France, and Germany in the Sino-Japanese crisis. But the importance of these alignments is to be judged by other considerations. In their history lies, in fact, much of the explanation of the period. The successive combinations which resulted from the affairs of the Near East had one thing in common, their lack of reality. At a first glance their positive effect seems slight. The Anglo-Franco-Russian co-operation of 1895 was important mainly because it provided a double check on British action. It made it certain that

the Armenian problem would survive to later generations (*cf.* Gooch and Temperley, *British Documents on the Origins of the War,* vol. X, pt. I, ch. LXXXVIII). At the end of the year the reply of the French foreign minister to the Russian inquiry as to his attitude if Russia should be compelled to intervene by force "settled once and for all the question of French support for Russian aspirations in the Near East". It was the end of "the honeymoon days of the Alliance" (p. 208). Professor Langer's analysis of Russian policy in 1896-1897 is among the most valuable parts of his book, for he throws new light from Russian sources, but he is justified in his conclusion that the effect on the relations of the powers was largely negative. "The Near Eastern crisis . . . marked the progressive disintegration of the old system of alliances" (p. 382). The Austro-Russian *rapprochement* of 1897 has, however, a more positive importance. Not only was it " 'a moral violation' of the Triple Alliance" (p. 382); it staved off disaster in Eastern Europe and it marked the breakdown of Austro-British co-operation. A full evaluation of British policy at this time has yet to be made, but it is perhaps not too much to say that the conclusions tentatively given here are likely to be borne out, in some respects at least, by further researches in the archives.

If Armenia, Crete, and Greece failed to provide more than a momentary basis for co-operation, and were already showing that the "good old-fashioned Eastern Question" served mainly as a brake on European combinations, the Far Eastern alignment of 1895 was equally unreal. It was an understanding based, like the Armenian Triplice, on mutual distrust (pp. 187-189). But the permanence of the relation is of small importance in comparison with the principle which it involved—the growing significance of the affairs of the Far East. "More and more they came to dominate the course of international relations" (p. 167). In this sphere "the Franco-Russian Alliance reached its finest bloom . . . in . . . 1896-7" (pp. 411-412), and its blooming turned the eyes of other powers in this direction. Russia and Germany settled their Far Eastern difficulties; the British approach to Russia failed; Britain abandoned the principle of territorial integrity in imitation of other powers, failed in the unreal assocation of the Anglo-German Agreement of 1900, and settled down to the policy which led to the Anglo-Japanese Alliance.

The final chapter on the Anglo-Japanese Alliance provides a suitable close, not merely from the point of view of date. For in his explanation of the British attitude, always in the forefront of his story, Professor Langer draws together the main threads that have run through these two volumes. His interpretation of British policy is, indeed, open to challenge. He lays great stress on Salisbury's isolationist creed. "The important thing for England", he says in speaking of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty, "was not what was in *the* Alliance, but the fact that there was *an* Alliance" (p. 783). He is perhaps over-aware of the distant shadow of the Triple Entente. Early in the work, when he is dealing with the Congo Treaty, he quotes Rosebery's warning "that if Ger-

many were going to side with France or appear to side with France in this and other African questions, we must consider our position as regards our general attitude in Europe, more particularly in the Mediterranean and the East" (p. 138)—surely an interesting reversal of Bismarck's attitude to Britain ten years before. One year after Toulon (when Dufferin wrote his famous dispatch commenting on the hostility of French public opinion towards Britain, see Gooch and Temperley, II, 285-288), four years before the Fashoda crisis—Rosebery's prophecy seems an idle threat. Yet it suggests the recurring theme of the period. Professor Langer returns to this theme insistently. He shows (perhaps he exaggerates, for this is one of the points where the available British sources are inadequate) the effect on Salisbury of "that disastrous day" during the Cowes visit when he met the Emperor William (pp. 199-202, 209-210). He lingers, with great effect, on the episode of the Kruger telegram, with its lasting influence on English public opinion—"one of the greatest blunders in the history of modern diplomacy" (p. 254). He comes back later to the same theme, when he deals with the influence of the fleet question, the last great factor in the failure of the reiterated efforts to bring about Anglo-German friendship. Professor Langer clearly holds that friendship was the real aim of Germany. "The trouble was that the Berlin foreign office was unwilling to strike at England in any vital matter, for the simple reason that the whole German policy aimed, ultimately, not at a struggle with England, but at an alliance with her" (p. 259). Thus from the Heligoland Treaty to the final Lansdowne-Metternich conversation of December, 1901—the end of the "pipe-dream"—the movement of Anglo-German relations dominates the rhythm of Europe.

Yet throughout, the complexity of the rhythm is made clear. In Professor Langer's treatment of the Franco-Russian Alliance and the Franco-Italian *rapprochement* (with its effect in weakening the Triple Alliance) we see the working of the principle set forth at the beginning of his book: "the French, once Bismarck had disappeared from the scene, passed from a static to a dynamic phase of foreign policy" (p. 10). Russian policy is given full weight, and the account of the relations between Britain and Russia is one of the most original features in his interpretation of the attitude of Britain. These themes are indeed subordinate, but if their importance is secondary it is certainly not for lack of detailed evidence. The impression left by the volumes is that their author has weighed carefully his mass of material, and distributed his emphasis with discrimination.

There is no doubt as to the thoroughness of the sifting of evidence. To the German, French, English and Austrian material he has added the less used Russian, and the volumes owe much to an exhaustive study of monographs and memoirs. He estimates them with admirable balance, and above all he recognizes their limitations. Repeatedly he points out that a final judgment must be based on fuller information. His comments on the absence of blue books for certain aspects of British policy (the Anglo-French negotia-

tions over the Congo, p. 137, the British attitude in the Sino-Japanese War, p. 185) suggest that perhaps he hopes too much from parliamentary papers. It is the archives rather than blue books that he needs. The most serious gap is in the materials for Salisbury's policy in the Near East (p. 196, pp. 209-210), although the most is made of the information available. Some of the points on which the sources are insufficient will no doubt always be subject to differences of opinion; on others we may hope for further enlightenment when we have more documentary material. In the meantime Professor Langer has given us a synthesis in which he differentiates clearly between what can be established and what is still matter for conjecture. We may differ from his judgment in some respects, or wish to vary the emphasis, but he puts all his evidence before us, and no writer on the period could fail to find his interpretation instructive and stimulating.

University of London. LILLIAN M. PENSON.

Great Britain and the German Navy. By E. L. WOODWARD, Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. viii, 524. $6.50.)

Now that the treaties limiting naval armaments are about to expire, and the press is full of rumors of large shipbuilding programs, the appearance of the first special study in English of Anglo-German naval rivalry is timely. Particularly instructive today are the vain efforts of Viscount Grey, when faced with the wreck of his hopes for naval limitation, to reduce international friction and suspicion by securing at least an exchange of information as to naval programs. If anyone still doubts the importance of this type of naval agreement, let him read the chapters which Mr. Woodward devotes to the alleged acceleration of naval construction in the German programs of 1908-1909 and 1909-1910.

Apart from twelve pages of documents on this latter topic, Mr. Woodward presents little that is new in the way of material. He makes good use of the great printed collections of British, German, and French documents, but pays surprisingly little attention to the question of British public opinion. It is no doubt true that Englishmen regardless of party agreed on the necessity of a fleet superior to that of Germany; and that the task of the advocate of large naval appropriations was far easier in England than in Germany or the United States. Englishmen differed widely, however, in their estimate of the naval situation and their views as to ways and means. Nor are the efforts made to rouse them to support larger appropriations devoid of interest and significance. A narrative of Anglo-German naval rivalry, therefore, which draws so little on the press runs the risk of presenting diplomatic history in a vacuum. If Mr. Woodward, for example, had consulted the *Morning Post* as well as the *Times,* he might not have underestimated so greatly the extent of British uneasiness at German naval increases prior to 1905.

Systematic neglect, moreover, of the activities of the British Navy League in a work which stresses the activity of its German counterpart leads one to doubt Mr. Woodward's success in treating Trojan and Tyrian alike. It is easy enough to find passages in the writings of British, or for that matter of American, navalists which are a fair match for the most extreme statements of Tirpitz and his followers. It is true that Mr. Woodward does not fall into the error of describing the German fleet as a "luxury". Admitting the force of his criticism of the validity of the German "risk" theory in the light of the changed diplomatic situation, and accepting without hesitation his statement that there was "no wish in England for a preventive war", one might still wish for a more complete exposition of the German belief in the value of a strong fleet, even though it could be no more than "a second-best poker hand".

The relegation to appendixes of the parliamentary debates on the two-power standard and of a discussion of Liberal opposition to the naval and foreign policy of the British Government, based on extracts from the *Economist,* deprives the narrative of important political background. Despite a few scattered references to assertions that munition manufacturers were active in influencing British policy, there is no discussion of this topic or reference to works such as G. H. Perris's *The War Traders.* More serious is the failure to treat the question of neutral rights in relation to Anglo-German naval rivalry. No mention is made of the difficult negotiations which led to the Declaration of London or of the successful campaign to arouse British sentiment against it and prevent its acceptance.

As a useful synthesis of the published diplomatic correspondence, with real merit in portraying the naval problem throughout in its relation to the general diplomatic background, Mr. Woodward's study is nonetheless a welcome addition to the literature dealing with the relation of force to national policy.

Harvard University. JAMES P. BAXTER 3D.

The Manchu Abdication and the Powers, 1908-1912: an Episode in Pre-War Diplomacy. By JOHN GILBERT REID. (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1935. Pp. xiii, 497. $5.00.)

The objectives and actions of the great powers relating to the Manchu realm during the Hsüan-T'ung reign constitute the topic chosen by Dr. Reid for an extremely detailed month by month analysis. He could scarcely have selected for study a more complicated or a more important segment of Chinese and of world history. Nor could a more objective, skillful, and thoroughly competent handling of involved details, with tracing of broad principles and clear statement of results, be imagined. That the work as a whole is one of the hardest to read in the whole field of Far Eastern studies, and that at times one all but despairs of seeing the forest for the trees, is no more the fault of the author than it would be the fault of a photographer

did he present a confused picture of an election riot or a multiple dogfight.

For a century China and the Manchu dynasty had been going downhill steadily. For considerably more than half that time the Western Powers—and, for over three decades, Japan—had been building and consolidating position and power within the territories ruled, or theoretically controlled, by Peking. When the last Manchu emperor succeeded to the Dragon Throne, Great Britain was the ally of China's most potent Asiatic neighbor, which was busily engaged in strengthening its interests on the mainland; France was allied to China's colossal land neighbor on the north; England and France, as well as England and Russia, were, officially, something more than friendly; Germany, without allies in the Far East, was still hoping to keep Russia engaged in northeastern Asia, pulling wires to prevent too great an increase of power to Japan, and toying with the possibility of a German-Chinese-American or an Anglo-German-American understanding or alliance, having for one of its objectives the maintenance of the integrity of China; the United States was about to change from a phase of realistic policy, under the leadership of Roosevelt, to one of dollar diplomacy, under Taft and Knox, based mainly on legal theory and documents—without due regard to the realities of the world situation. When the inexperienced and inept Prince Ch'un took over the reins of government, dropped, in November, 1908, by the Tzu Hsi grand empress dowager, increasing numbers of Chinese in the central and southern provinces, long irked by the effete rule of the Manchus, whom they still looked upon as aliens and whom they blamed—vociferously when they dared—for internal confusion and external aggression, wishfully believed the mandate of heaven was being withdrawn and were anxious to aid heaven in every way possible. That the empire was in reality administered largely by Chinese of every province was conveniently ignored—as has generally been the case since 1912.

A seven-page bibliography indicates official and secondary sources dealing with the principal countries the policies of which are studied. Conspicuously lacking, unfortunately, are Chinese and Japanese primary sources with the exception of treaties and agreements. A statement in the preface indicates that the author has used certain materials supplied to him, "often in strict confidence", which are not listed. The text, which runs to a little over three hundred pages, is accompanied by more than one hundred pages of notes and citations containing a mass of valuable supplementary material. An excellent map and a sixty-page index, in which the positions and terms of office of the chief characters of the drama are included, round out a first-rate study.

The University of Chicago. H. F. MacNair.

The Eve of 1914. By Theodor Wolff, Editor of the *Berliner Tageblatt,* 1906-1933. Translated from the German for the first time by E. W. Dickes. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1936. Pp. 655. $4.50.)

This book is definitely an attempt at a psychological approach to the

problem of war responsibility. Consequently diplomatic crises become merely tactical maneuvers of statesmen. These men are carefully analyzed and their characters vividly portrayed, often in the light of personal knowledge. The final dictum is a general accusation of "intellectual inadequacy", especially pronounced in the German statesmen. "Those who challenge their intelligence . . . . dispose of the charge, thoroughly false as it certainly is, that Germany or her rulers out of evil intention long nursed, cunningly and of set purpose provoked the war". As Pontius Pilate is popularly burdened with the responsibility for the death of Christ so these men share in more or less degree the responsibility for the war. This comparison explains the original German title, *Der Krieg des Pontius Pilatus* (Zurich, 1934).

The best section is one which deals with popular feeling. Here the literary gifts of the author are most evident. There was a small group in each country that talked of national obligations and the virtues of war, but the everyday life of the world was that of peace. Yet inevitably war was coming, and tragically the peaceful people were turned into a jubilant, howling mob at the outbreak of war. As a mob, jubilant; as individuals, heartbroken and fearful. It is an unforgettable picture of "The Death of the Waltz", as the author entitles the transition from nineteenth century gay serenity to the tango tempo of 1914.

The political narrative begins when Bethmann-Hollweg became chancellor of Germany and deals with only the major diplomatic crises. We are told that the book was finished before the author left Germany in 1933. There are no footnotes, and apparently the author has not used the new editions of the French, English, Russian, or, except for one or two quotations, Austrian documents. *Die Grosse Politik* and numerous memoirs are his chief sources. How the German foreign office requested him to expose in the *Berliner Tageblatt* the Anglo-Russian negotiations for a naval agreement in 1914, and how the German statesmen in the July days of 1914 innocently clung to the idea that they could avoid the war, are perhaps the most significant specific contributions from his personal experience. The bulk of the book naturally deals with Germany. The Balkan powers, Turkey, and Italy do not receive their due. Schemua's visit to Berlin was on November 22, not December 12, 1912, and came before the reappointment of Conrad as chief of staff, not after. An examination of the Austrian documents (nos. 4559, 4571, 4606, 8414, 8934) would certainly have led to a different interpretation of the Springe interview of December, 1912, and would have altered the statement that Germany in October, 1913, "as a matter of prudence" promised Austria only "moral support". The Austrian documents do mention (nos. 4893, 4941) Pasič's attempt to get an interview with Berchtold in December, 1912 (p. 207); Rumania obtained Silistria in August, 1913, not in November, 1913 (p. 170); Francis Ferdinand and Conrad did attend the German maneuvers in the fall of 1913 (p. 171), and Francis Ferdinand

was, of course, not the son of Francis Joseph (p. 200). The author's penchant for psychological explanations sometimes leads him to shoot beyond the mark. For example, Berchtold's natural desire to present the Austrian program to William II before the latter left on his Scandinavian cruise in July, 1914, becomes the following subtle scheme: "It was essential to catch him first; now, a week after the assassination, he would still be in the right mood, but on the rippling waves of the peaceful fiords, his inconstant soul might shrink from any binding engagement, he might have too much time for reflection or might fall under the influence of peacefully inclined advisors".

The translation is admirable, and the book in many ways is a literary masterpiece. This is its chief claim to distinction, for it does not add materially to our knowledge of the origins of the war.

Bowdoin College. E. C. HELMREICH.

Gustav Stresemann: his Diaries, Letters, and Papers. Edited and translated by ERIC SUTTON. Volume I. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. 506. $5.00.)

THIS translation of the first volume of Stresemann's *Vermächtnis* enables a greater number of Anglo-Saxon scholars to study the statesmanship of the distinguished German foreign minister. Mr. Eric Sutton has made an excellent selection from the diaries, letters, and papers, which were originally edited by Henry Bernhard, and has written a commendable introduction to the documentary history. These hitherto unpublished documents throw useful light on democratic Germany's diplomatic negotiations with the western powers as well as on certain domestic phases of German postwar politics. The book includes documentary materials on the invasion of the Ruhr, Stresemann's hundred days as chancellor of the Reich, the way to a world policy through the Dawes Plan, and personal ideals and new aims during the crisis of 1924.

Stresemann is revealed in this first volume of his record of statesmanship as the great parliamentary leader and the rising world personality of postwar Germany. It was his tragic fate to be the protagonist of liberalism, constitutionalism, and internationalism during the lustrum when his countrymen were wavering in their support of these ideals. His monarchical patriotism, his genial nature, indeed his very skill as a negotiator, condemned him to follow the internal policy of compromise and the external "policy of fulfilment", which in the end destroyed the German republic. "Statesmanship in a divided people", Stresemann wrote, "can never be other than a policy of compromise." This thesis is developed in the remarkable fragment of an autobiography which prefaces the documents and again in the memorial article on Bassermann.

The materials concerning Stresemann's aims in the settlement of the Ruhr conflict, in passive resistance and inflation, and in securing the accept-

ance of the Dawes report are of great historical importance. The reader is taken into the labyrinth of secret negotiations with French and English statesmen concerning the industrial and military evacuation of the Ruhr which Stresemann regarded as the indispensable condition for obtaining the needed parliamentary majority for the experts' proposals. The documents indicate American pressure for evacuation and economic settlement at the London Conference. C. E. Mitchell asked Stresemann to withhold the official statement on war guilt until the loan had been taken up by the individual American subscribers.

From the vast amount of materials concerning the crises which threatened the German republic the following samples are taken. General von Lossow reported, October, 1923, that the suppression of the *Völkischer Beobachter* would cause "great excitement in the best patriotic circles". When the Hitler *Putsch* occurred, November 8, 1923, Stresemann underestimated the character and ability of the future leader and asserted that his attack on Marxism, ultramontanism, and Judaism was "in the void sphere of ideas". President Ebert, however, saw in the political crisis of December, 1923, the beginnings of the decline of parliamentary government. When the Social Democrats turned out the Stresemann cabinet, Ebert informed the Socialist leaders that they would see the consequences of their folly for the next ten years.

By 1924 Stresemann was well aware that the great living forces of the nation were not represented by the parties alone. He forecasted the rise of extremist revolutionary groups and front line soldier organizations. Finally, he predicted that the nation would unfortunately gravitate between communism and national radicalism.

Stanford University. RALPH HASWELL LUTZ.

AMERICAN HISTORY

Legislative Problems: Development, Status, and Trend of the Treatment and Exercise of Lawmaking Powers. By ROBERT LUCE, a Member of the General Court of Massachusetts for nine years; of the Governor's Council, as Lieutenant-Governor; of a Constitutional Convention; and of the Congress of the United States for sixteen years. [The Science of Legislation.] (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1935. Pp. vi, 762. $6.00.)

ONE of the serious "casualties" in the Democratic landslide of 1932, the defeat of Congressman Luce in his campaign for re-election, finds partial compensation in the fact that release from the burdens of actual lawmaking has enabled him to bring to a fitting conclusion his magnum opus, "The Science of Legislation." Who else would have had the background of experience, the zest for research, the balanced judgment, and the patient persistence necessary to accomplish that task!

This final volume of the series deals with a great variety of live questions

of the present, though some of them involve principles discussed or applied by Hammurabi, Confucius, or Aristotle. Almost every state in the Union has been called to testify to its attempted solutions of these problems, and no continent's experience has been neglected in the quest. The mass of material is so vast and so varied that upon a single phase of a problem illustrations may be drawn from Finland, Turkey, and Uruguay, or from Connecticut, Czechoslovakia, and Peru.

In Chapter IV is discussed the long-debated question of the President's unrestricted power to remove executive officials from offices filled by presidential appointment. According to Mr. Luce (pp. 133-134), it "received at last definite adjudication (save for the possibility of reversal) in the case of Myers v. U. S., 272 U. S., 52 (1926)". Mr. Luce's "saving" parenthesis is interesting, for in the very month when this book went to press, in a unanimous decision in the case of Humphrey's Executor (Rathbun) *v.* United States, 295 U. S. 602, May 27, 1935, the Supreme Court clearly modified its attitude toward the President's power of removal.

Through several chapters (IX, "The Cabinet System"; X, "Responsible Government"; XI, "Cabinets for the United States") there is continued a discriminating discussion of the fusion of legislative and executive functions, as found in many European countries. Woodrow Wilson's laudatory account of cabinet government in Great Britain is subjected to critical analysis, and more recent experiments with forms of parliamentary responsibility are discussed with candor, from the standpoint of a close observer, during twenty years of experience in American legislatures, state and national. His own conviction is summed up thus:

> The system of ministerial responsibility [the English system] is far inferior to the American system in point of legislative efficiency. With us the legislator legislates. However imperfect the process, it is better than that of habitual acquiescence with occasional revolt. By the use of committees free to exercise independent judgment, we energize large numbers of men who in Parliament would be idle and helpless. We enlist individual responsibility. Thus we do actually bring to bear upon the problems of government many minds, and whether each contributes little or much, the sum total of wisdom thus amassed is worth the while. Surely it better reflects the will of the citizens who make up the republic [p. 339].

In Chapter XVII, "Delegation", the author sets forth the method and scope of the handing over of power by the legislature to the executive in many countries. As regards the United States, while freely acknowledging that in times of great depression there should and must be increase of delegation, he joins many critics in the belief that under the present administration there have been many delegations which have been clearly beyond constitutional authority (p. 531).

Yet Mr. Luce repeatedly insists that a major reason why the work of American legislatures is so unsatisfactory is that they undertake such an enormous

volume of detailed legislative work, instead of designing new machinery to meet new legislative problems. In particular, he believes that a vast mass of administrative regulations might be better handled by a small, continuing body than by committees of the legislature or by the legislature itself. At the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention of 1917, and more recently in his *Legislative Assemblies,* he sponsored a proposal "to add administrative law-making to the duties of the Governor's Council". In Massachusetts this council is an elective group of eight members, with the lieutenant governor *ex officio,* which meets once a week and passes upon the governor's appointments and his recommendations for pardon, and performs various minor functions. Mr. Luce suggests that the council be appointed by the governor and confirmed by the senate, for a long term, with gradual renewal and reasonable salaries and retirement allowances. The importance of ridding our state legislatures and Congress of the enormous, time-consuming burden of detailed administrative lawmaking is beyond question, and this proposal deserves careful study. But before the council of Massachusetts is adopted as the model to be followed in reorganizing state legislatures and Congress, it would be interesting to consider whether it does not have features which might make it possible for an astute and unscrupulous politician in the governor's chair so to manipulate it as to make it an effective device for advancing his own personal ambitions.

In conclusion Mr. Luce discusses the need for trained men in our legislatures and sets forth both the discouragements and the inducements which may affect young people's decisions whether or not to "go into politics". He ennobles the legislator's calling, insisting that it offers "the opportunity to be of wider service to one's fellows than is presented in any other field of endeavor,—for the law-maker can help toward making life happier for millions of mankind". He stresses the importance of experience and bespeaks a higher appreciation of the opportunities presented by membership in a state legislature. In his opinion, "the work of a state legislature brings more of personal satisfaction to the member than he is likely to find in the national House of Representatives, as in point of principles and policies the work of the state legislature is broader".

Fortunate—but very rare—is the man who "in ending the avocation of twenty years" can see its results embodied in such a valuable service to good government and to sound learning as may be found in the four volumes of Robert Luce's "The Science of Legislation".

Worcester Polytechnic Institute. GEORGE H. HAYNES.

The Lees of Virginia: Biography of a Family. By BURTON J. HENDRICK. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1935. Pp. xii, 455. $3.75.)

THE story of few American families through six generations is worth the telling. The Adams family of Massachusetts and the Lee family of Virginia are notable exceptions. The first found a historian in James Truslow Adams;

the second is here equally well supplied. These family histories taken together offer a surprisingly full account of the early periods of American history.

Mr. Hendrick's volume is divided into four parts. The first deals with the establishment of the Lee family in America early in "Virginia's golden age". The second traces the steps by which it became thoroughly Americanized through the "six sons of Stratford". The third treats of the Revolutionary period, in which it turned radical and joined hands with the Adams family for independence. The last follows the family into "decline" as it again became conservative in the Lees of Leesylvania and such figures as "Light Horse Harry" and Robert Edward.

The proportions of the book are rather startling. The emigrant Richard and his immediate descendants are accorded about as much space as is given to the commander of the Army of Northern Virginia and his immediate forbears, on whom the fame of the family now largely rests. The Revolutionary group, on the other hand, is granted more than twice the number of pages allotted to these combined. The emphasis is therefore heavily on the liberal members and activities of the family, and the great figure, whether intentional or not, becomes Richard Henry Lee, whose friendship with the Adams family seems to have been his outstanding virtue.

To tell the story of the Lee family requires, of necessity, the telling of much Virginia and much national history. The early Lees were typical planters and typical colonials of the ruling clique. Mr. Hendrick has skillfully suggested through them the ways by which men, largely of unknown origins, acquired lands and, in time, built splendid estates; how they dominated public office through the favors of the governor; and how they kept touch with the Old World by frequent visits and by the sending of favored sons to Oxford and Cambridge. He offers a splendid case study in the evolution of Virginia aristocracy.

Richard Lee, who founded the family in America, probably had no blue blood in his veins. But he did have the average Englishman's ambition to own land and the courage of the few to cross the Atlantic in order to secure it. There he stubbornly followed Berkeley in support of the Stuarts and rose to the offices of attorney general, "secretary of state", and membership in the council. Some of his sons went to Oxford, married into the other great tidewater families, and stood by things established against the rebellious Bacon. The third generation, in Thomas Lee of the Stratford line, rounded out the family acres and reached the highest office in the colony—"President of Virginia".

The attitudes and activities of the younger sons of the Stratford line, Arthur, William, and Richard Henry, enable Mr. Hendrick to present an excellent study of the Revolutionary movement in Virginia. Richard Henry, especially, shows the steady drift from moderate to radical positions. He early criticized slavery on economic grounds; he helped to expose the irregu-

larities of Speaker Robinson in office; he took a leading part in resistance to taxation by Parliament and early advocated complete independence. Arthur, by his associations with English liberals and by his correspondence with Dickinson, Dulany, and Samuel Adams, reveals the wide variation in both English and American opinion. William, who was set aside to live abroad and help tobacco to profits, furnishes the opportunity to evaluate economic factors. History through biography has seldom been so complete. But the resulting picture of the Revolution is one according to Lecky. England was generally in the wrong. The "new school" of historians, who have more widely distributed the blame, are dismissed in one paragraph.

The diplomatic services of this group of Lees are particularly well presented and, when brought together and revalued, add to their reputation. William, by his negotiations with the citizens of Amsterdam, is credited indirectly with bringing Holland to the American side; Arthur is shown to have had more of ability and insight than Franklin and Deane, who pushed him aside at Paris because of his connection with rival western land interests; he is also shown to have been correct in all his charges against the mixing of trade and diplomacy by Silas Deane and to have understood properly that "first lame duck in American history". Evidently the young nation suffered heavily for its failure to appreciate the keen ability of the tribe of Lee.

There is nothing new in approach or material in the treatment of Harry Lee or his illustrious son, Robert Edward. The flavor is popular, not particularly penetrating or original. The sketches are brief, and one gains the impression that the author has lost something of his fervor and is merely rounding out a story.

A few overbold statements need checking. It is not entirely correct to say that the prime motive back of the planting of the colonies was the desire for "masts, timber, tar, rosin and the like". It is even more incorrect to divide Virginians into "plantation magnates" and "hangers-on of the fringes of civilization". The statement that Hinton Helper "was regarded by the South as entirely responsible for John Brown's raid" is as wide of the mark as is the assertion that the principles involved in the Whisky Rebellion were the same as those which led to war in 1861.

Such errors, however, do not greatly detract from a well-written and well-digested study of one more of America's "noble families".

The University of Chicago. AVERY CRAVEN.

Royal Instructions to British Colonial Governors, 1670-1776. Collated and edited by LEONARD WOOD LABAREE, Assistant Professor of History, Yale University. Two volumes. [The American Historical Association, The Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund.] (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1935. Pp. xxv, 462; ix, 463-937. $10.00.)

THE old colonies were tied to England in a network of closely woven

economic and political threads. Historians have come to appreciate the meaning of these ties and to give the colonies their proper setting in the larger English world. This is not to deny that the colonies experienced an evolution expressive of a genius and temperament peculiarly their own. The American Revolution confirms that fact; it also confirms the fact that it took the keen edge of war to cut the ties binding the colonies to the metropolis. It is to say that colonial history is inadequately understood apart from the English connection. The eighteenth century was distinctly the era of the royal province. By 1776 a score of colonies were under royal government, each equipped with a corp of officials responsible directly or indirectly to the crown. The fact is that colonial political growth was influenced and directed by the presence of royal power.

The chief agent of royal authority was the governor. The royal commission and instructions issued to him formed a written constitution for the province. The commission, a formal and simple grant of power in broad terms, was of far less importance than the detailed instructions, which provided rules of conduct in the use of the general powers. In truth, a great majority of the colonies lived under government directed by instructions from the crown.

In spite of the importance of these instructions they were not easily available. Only about thirteen per cent of over two hundred sets of instructions have been printed before. To publish all the rest of them in full—long, detailed, and extremely verbose and repetitious as they are—would have entailed a large amount of space and much expense to no good purpose. Moreover, the wholesale printing of many articles common to all royal colonies and governors would have tended strongly to hide significant variations and mutations. It was no easy task to devise a method to bring an embarrassing mass of words within a compass both moderate and serviceable and yet to retain the essence of all articles. No device, under the conditions, could be entirely simple, but Dr. Labaree has solved a vexatious problem so that students should have no difficulty in following his plan. He has reduced and collated within less than eleven hundred articles the entire collection of instructions from 1670 to 1776 for all royal provinces from Nova Scotia to Barbados. The many and various instructions are arranged according to subject, organs and powers of government, financial affairs, religion and morals, and so on through the entire circle of interests, political, economic, and social, in which royal power was exercised. A system of cross references will be of assistance in tracing a subject backward and forward.

Dr. Labaree has accomplished well and wisely a task that stood in need of consummation, and those who have occasion to use these volumes will be grateful to him. The very nature of the undertaking called for a prodigious amount of patient and competent labor; a high standard of scholarship is evident throughout; and further, the author came to this work equipped

with an intimate knowledge of royal instructions acquired in making his admirable study of *Royal Government in America,* published in 1930. One using this collation of instructions will do well to read carefully that study, which gives life and meaning to government by royal prerogative.

A word of caution is pertinent, as Dr. Labaree points out. A reading of the instructions does not of course show to what extent they were carried out. It was one thing to issue a royal order, quite another to enforce it. In some cases actual conditions defied instructions. In other cases Colonial opposition nullified them. And finally, it should be kept in mind that by 1776, or even earlier, royal power in the colonies had been subjected to popular control. Government by royal instructions tells only one side of the story. The transition from colony under royal power to commonwealth under popular control is the more important part of Anglo-American history in colonial days. To say this is by no means to imply that a study of royal government is not important. These volumes are justifiable and are by that token welcome.

University of Iowa. W. T. Root.

A History of Pennsylvania. By Wayland Fuller Dunaway, Professor of American History, The Pennsylvania State College. [Prentice-Hall History Series, Carl Wittke, Editor.] (New York: Prentice-Hall. 1935. Pp. xxiii, 828. $5.00.)

Nevada: a History of the State from the Earliest Times through the Civil War. By Effie Mona Mack. (Glendale: Arthur H. Clark Company. 1936. Pp. 495. $6.00.)

It happens that several of the state histories appearing in the Prentice-Hall Series have come before the writer for review. The *History of Pennsylvania* is undoubtedly one of the best which have so far appeared. The author admirably attains his goal of a one-volume history "suitable for the general reader and adapted to the requirements of a college text-book". The political development is greatly condensed in order to reserve space for the presentation of the economic and social development, to which is accorded almost half the total number of pages. There is a good selection of material, admirably organized for its purpose into divisions within the chapters, and presented in an easy, readable style. The treatment of the individual phases of the story is comprehensive and fair, as is well illustrated in chapter XXI, "Pennsylvania in the Civil War". The various elements in the state, racial and religious, stand out clearly in their political and economic interplay. Emphasis is properly laid on contributions to the development of progress. The bibliographies at the close of each chapter are frankly "selective" but should afford the general reader sufficient guidance to other materials.

The map of the state, which appears as a frontispiece, is distinctly dis-

appointing. Too much detail is crowded into limited space with the inevitable result that names mentioned in the text can be located only with the greatest difficulty. There are a few errors due to careless proofreading.

This history of Nevada is particularly welcome, as accounts of the newer states of the Pacific region are not so numerous as those of the older states of the Union. It would probably have a wider usefulness as a reference book if it had covered the entire story of this state instead of carrying it only through the Civil War.

This is an interesting story, interestingly told. The contribution made by Nevada to the development of the West is clearly brought out. Also, what is of decided importance for a better understanding of the Civil War period, the role which was played by Nevada in the history of the Federal Union during the middle decades of the past century is emphasized. The author follows an orderly, chronological development with four additional chapters which could probably not easily be assimilated into the preceding historical narrative. There is some repetition, justifiable in itself, but rather peculiarly handled. For instance, John Reese is introduced (pp. 411-413) without textual reference to the fact that he has already been discussed (pp. 149-150). The maps, goodly in number, are not entirely satisfactory. The reader will feel the need of one large map to show the location of counties, including enough of the neighboring state of California to place obscure points in Nevada in proper relation to Los Angeles. References to manuscript materials in the notes and in the really excellent bibliography are not in orthodox form. The publisher has been generous in the insertion of illustrative material, much of it valuable and some of it hitherto unpublished.

Goucher College. ELLA LONN.

James Edward Oglethorpe, Imperial Idealist. By AMOS ASCHBACH ETTINGER. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. xi, 348. $5.50.)

"I know of no man whose Life would be more interesting", Dr. Johnson assured his old friend, General Oglethorpe, and added: "If I were furnished with materials, I should be very glad to write it." Oglethorpe modestly demurred, and neither Johnson nor Boswell, who took some notes toward a biography, persisted. Until now all the biographies have suffered not only from the lack of such personal details as Boswell might have furnished, but from neglect of essential documentary sources. Only recently, to be sure, have some of these become available: the Egmont diary, Spanish records of the Florida-Georgia contests in arms and diplomacy, the Boswell papers with their glimpses of Oglethorpe's later "mellow days of old friendships and old books", of which Dr. Ettinger makes the most. The Egmont diary had already been used, rather superficially, by Leslie F. Church in his *Oglethorpe: a Study of Philanthropy in England and Georgia* (London, 1932). But

Church—unlike Ettinger—minimized the strategic aspects of Oglethorpe's great enterprise; more serious, he obscured the fact that Georgia originated in the current philanthropic movement.

Dr. Ettinger has brought both industry and a Boswellian enthusiasm to his task—an enthusiasm which does not flag even in the overly detailed narrative of those Jacobite intrigues which surrounded James Edward's youth but left so slight a mark upon his career as a man. As for his research, he seems to have missed no important collection of materials save the Minutes of the Associates of Dr. Bray, the organization out of which developed the Georgia Trust. These manuscripts, he found to his regret, were inaccessible in London. Apparently he was not aware that the Library of Congress possesses photofilms which include the earlier minutes (1730-1735) that were supposedly lost. These would have provided him with significant evidence of Oglethorpe's leadership in the first stages of the charitable colony project, but would have led him to modify some of his more sweeping claims for Oglethorpe at the expense of the Bray circle of philanthropists. Though Ettinger has managed better than Church to untangle the complex story of Georgia's origins, he has, unfortunately, introduced some fresh difficulties through factual errors regarding the D'Allone trusteeship and the King legacy (pp. 112, 115).

Despite these and other slips, Dr. Ettinger has written a learned book. Its chief defects arise from his somewhat uncritical enthusiasm for Oglethorpe as an author, and even more for Oglethorpe as a liberal political philosopher "whose spirit ran half a century and more ahead of his age". Oglethorpe did plead for equality of treatment for the continental colonies with the sugar islands; but his enlightened mercantilism hardly qualifies him to be regarded as a precursor of Adam Smith, "of the great Chatham, of Edmund Burke, of Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson" (pp. 101, 109, *et passim*). Nor can Oglethorpe, despite an Oxford education and the literary friendships of his last years, be certainly named as the actual author of even one pamphlet. Ettinger accepts Church's dubious ascription to him of the sole authorship of *The Sailor's Advocate* (1727), a compilation which he probably edited for the press. Again, in his zeal to restore to Oglethorpe the credit for writing a well-known Georgia tract of 1732, Ettinger manages by means of quotations—no doubt inadvertently—completely to misrepresent the present reviewer's argument for Benjamin Martyn's authorship (pp. 121-122 and note). *An Essay on Plantations,* which he also attributes to Oglethorpe, was actually the famous essay by Francis Bacon!

When, however, he turns from such exaggerated claims to examine the central aspects of Oglethorpe's career, he writes fairly, critically, and with an excellent knowledge of historical background. Nowhere does he overrate Oglethorpe's military talents: he does justice to the South Carolinians in the controverted Florida campaigns; he shows the fortuitous nature of the crucial victory at Bloody Marsh. He holds a high opinion of Oglethorpe's

character, certainly, but he does not gloss over the deceit practiced upon Newcastle and the Trustees in 1738, when, for large diplomatic stakes, Oglethorpe successfully confused the identity of Fort King George and Fort Saint George. The accounts of Oglethorpe's administration in Georgia and of his relations with the other Trustees, as well as the narratives of military and diplomatic events, are clear, well balanced, and historically adequate.

The University of Michigan. VERNER W. CRANE.

Archives of Maryland. Volume LII, *Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland, 1755-1756.* Edited by J. HALL PLEASANTS. [Published by Authority of the State under the Direction of the Maryland Historical Society.] (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society. 1935. Pp. xxxvi, 697.)

THIS volume, the twenty-fourth of the sub-series relating to proceedings of the assembly, is concerned with that period in which the defense of the frontier was the most acute problem and the expedition and defeat of General Braddock the most notable event. Strangely enough neither the lower nor the upper house of assembly manifested serious concern over the danger on the frontier, the lower house particularly contending that Maryland was "more remotely concerned" in the intended expedition than almost any other colony on the continent. Besides, the houses must needs "tithe their cummin". What could be more important than the disposition of the proceeds from licenses on ordinaries? Customarily they were a perquisite of the proprietary, and the lower house would fain control them. The governor had indeed admonished the two houses "to avoid the Rock" on which they had been wont to split, yet, in the language of the editor, the lower house "decided to steer straight" for that same rock—with the result that, for the time being, there was a failure of supplies for His Majesty's service.

Maryland, however, was not alone among the colonies in that shortcoming, as Braddock had already vociferously testified; nor was Maryland alone in manifesting a disinclination to accept parliamentary dictation in the matter of supplies for that service. In fact, the drift toward self-determination begins to reveal itself in these Maryland proceedings as in those of other colonies. On the other hand, it deserves to be noted that the lower house, in an address to the governor, March 10, 1755, strongly opposed the formation of one general government for America, such as had been proposed at Albany the year before, on the ground that it "would absolutely subvert that happy Form of Government which we have a Right to by our Charter . . . . and destroy the Rights, Liberties, and Properties of his Majesty's loyal Subjects in this Province". It is also to be observed that in March, 1756, the two houses calmly concurred in the enactment of a stamp tax.

While the dispute between the two houses over the supply bills had long been chronic, in this two-year period the breach widened, the controversy grew in intensity. Not so, however, as regards one phase of the business.

After Braddock's defeat, such was the fear of Indian incursions that appropriations to pay bounties for scalps were, as a rule, speedily forthcoming. And the price of scalps, be it recorded, rose at an unprecedented rate.

Not all the assembly's concerns, of course, revolved about questions of taxation and supplies for the military service. Tobacco, for instance, the state's great staple, called for frequent legislation; and the Catholic question was perennial. The lower house persisted in pushing measures designed to hold Catholicism in repression, while the upper house and the governor were just as persistent in efforts to nullify or tone down such measures. In the view of Dr. Pleasants this repression was in large measure responsible for the fact that, when the Revolution came, the Catholics of Maryland, almost to a man, espoused the Revolutionary side.

The "Letter of Transmittal" by the society's committee on publication, namely, Samuel K. Dennis, J. Hall Pleasants, and John M. Vincent, is an admirably instructive commentary on the assembly proceedings of the period.

Carnegie Institution of Washington. EDMUND C. BURNETT.

The British Régime in Wisconsin and the Northwest. By LOUISE PHELPS KELLOGG, Senior Research Associate of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. [Publications of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, edited by Joseph Schafer.] (Madison: the Society. 1935. Pp. xvii, 361. $2.50.)

IN the volume under consideration Miss Kellogg tells the story of the Old Northwest from the Capitulation of Montreal in 1760 to the aftermath of the Treaty of Ghent. She rightly assumes that in this period either British authority was paramount in the Northwest or else British influence prevailed in the portion of it that centers in the present state of Wisconsin. On Wisconsin, as the title indicates, Miss Kellogg has based her story, and it holds the center of her narrative. The reader, therefore, will naturally have to make the allowances for the foreshortening which such a treatment necessarily entails. Miss Kellogg ingenuously confesses that after 1763 the British maintained no posts within the present limits of the state; and inasmuch as she so frankly calls attention to the foreshortening mentioned, it does not call for criticism.

Miss Kellogg's method of treatment is conservative. It involves a continued alternation between larger considerations of national and international policy and the trade and activity of the people actually living in the Wisconsin region. Generally the alternation is skillfully performed. She tells her story interestingly but with the cautious reserve and suspense of judgment which the new history seems to be rendering unfashionable. As a sample of her determination to speak by the book, Miss Kellogg deliberately refrains from that fascinating sport of endeavoring to fathom the character of the silky Shelburne.

Miss Kellogg has not attempted an exactly balanced allotment of space, and this in general makes the volume more readable. Certain episodes re-

ceive special attention, perhaps out of relation to their actual importance; but they are always interestingly done. For instance, a short and engaging account of Pontiac's conspiracy in Wisconsin is followed by a detailed study of the mysterious episode of Major Robert Rogers's alleged conspiracy at Mackinac, linking it with the problem of Jonathan Carver's exploration and book. Miss Kellogg affords a clear and satisfying solution of the mystery well worth the three chapters it takes up. In passing she deals adequately with the Bostwick mining enterprises and the attempts of the Rigaud de Vaudreuils to possess themselves of Green Bay under a French grant. The present reviewer has not so much sympathy as Miss Kellogg to bestow on these claimants.

This group of chapters is the high light of her volume; from it the narrative flows on, dealing on more or less conventional lines with the onset and events of the Revolution in the West and with the military, political, and commercial struggle of Great Britain and the United States for mastery between 1783 and 1815. The familiar facts are retold with the light and interpretation added by bits of information about larger matters of policy on the one hand and smaller questions of the trading personnel of the Wisconsin region on the other.

As might be expected in a book of 350 pages covering so extended a field, Miss Kellogg's sources are mainly the printed ones, supplemented by certain other bodies of digested and arranged source material and by manuscripts from the treasures of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Naturally the book contains some of those maddening slips which fix themselves firmly in the blind spot of an author's eye until he opens his published volume.

Some things the reviewer would have done differently, for instance the appraisal of the Yorke-Camden opinion with its influence on the American Revolution, and the discussion of boundaries and diplomacy; but the latter is merely the fruit of the hazy work which has generally passed muster on the subject in American historiography; it merely causes the reviewer to wonder once more why, with all the sound scholarship that has been expended on the French and Indian War, that phase should have remained so long untouched. The full story of the Treaty of 1783 has not yet been told, but Miss Kellogg could have taken into account the Franco-Spanish complications so far as Bemis and Whitaker have worked them out. At long last, however, the book is the sort of book Miss Kellogg could have been expected to write on the subject, and in the reviewer's mind that is very high praise indeed.

The University of Illinois. THEODORE CALVIN PEASE.

The Jeffersonian Tradition in American Democracy. By CHARLES MAURICE WILTSE. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1935. Pp. xii, 273. $3.00.)

ONE of the innumerable by-products of the New Deal agitation, a thor-

oughly wholesome one, has been a marked revival of interest in the political theories of Thomas Jefferson. The appearance of Mr. Wiltse's volume is therefore especially timely. It is not, however, a contribution to current propaganda but a temperate and scholarly treatment of Jefferson's system of political philosophy and its influence throughout our subsequent history. Especially interesting is the analysis of the sources of Jefferson's ideas, the writers who influenced his intellectual development, and the conditions which made his doctrines so influential in the contemporary and subsequent struggles of American politics. Jefferson's opponents were fond of making it appear that he drew most of his inspiration from Paris, which then, like present-day Moscow, constituted the great reservoir of political and social abominations, but Mr. Wiltse corroborates the findings of other students in his conclusion that "Jefferson's background was predominantly English and his debt to French thought was small". The influence of Jefferson's American environment is given due recognition.

The chapters on separation of powers and the functions of government are of particular interest in the light of current controversy, and the author lays emphasis on the fact, sometimes forgotten, that Jefferson was "a lawyer of considerable ability". Mr. Wiltse offers a few pages on the New Deal in the light of the Jeffersonian tradition but points out that "it will be many years before any adequate evaluation can be made". It might have been better to omit this necessarily sketchy treatment and allow the reader to apply for himself the author's careful analysis of the apparently contradictory individualistic and socialistic tendencies in Jefferson's theories. They have produced, as he points out, a "dual tradition" in American democracy which may eventually produce a workable compromise between "economic anarchy" on the one hand and "planned and controlled economy" on the other.

Jefferson would look askance at many of those who are lauding his philosophy in 1936, but amid the tumult and the shouting of a presidential year he would doubtless find that one of his fundamental principles was still in vigorous operation. As Mr. Wiltse puts it, "His legacy is not his solution of the political problem, but his realization that the problem must be solved anew in each succeeding era. Our heritage is his faith that an informed and intelligent people can and will work out their own salvation."

Historians, political scientists, and philosophers can make good use of the present study. So could politicians.

Dartmouth College. W. A. Robinson.

Colombia and the United States, 1765-1934. By E. Taylor Parks, Department of History and Political Science, Berea College. [Duke University Publications.] (Durham: Duke University Press. 1935. Pp. xx, 554. $4.00.)

This volume deals with the relations between the United States and an

important Latin-American nation and therefore merits careful consideration. The author has made extensive use of the archives of the Department of State. As the only other detailed survey of the relations between the United States and Colombia—that by the Colombian scholar Raimundo Rivas—stops in 1850, the book under review should fill a sad gap in historical literature.

In his preface Dr. Parks observes that, as the foreign relations of a state can be better comprehended if its domestic affairs are understood, he has alloted considerable space to Colombia's internal history. Perhaps this helps to explain why he devotes about one fifth of his book to a consideration of the years before 1823, the colonial period and the age of revolution, a period when, however, the foreign relations of northern South America were not of prime importance. In another part of the monograph he allots a disproportionate amount of space to domestic problems in Colombia which had little direct bearing on her relations with the United States. On the other hand, his discussion of an event having a significant bearing on his general topic, the acknowledgment of Colombian independence by European nations, is rather brief.

Not until two hundred pages have been perused does one reach what seems to be the real theme of this work, the policy of the United States toward an Isthmian canal. A brief description of the negotiation of the Treaty of 1846 between the United States and New Granada is followed by a detailed consideration of the relations between those countries under that treaty. Five chapters are then concerned with what is styled the evolution of our canal policy, which is interpreted to mean the construction and control of an Isthmian canal by the United States. Eighty-five pages are alloted to a most important event in inter-American relations, the Panama Revolution of 1903 and its aftermath. Though chapter XXV, entitled "A Case in International Morality", is perhaps the most interesting chapter in the book, yet it scarcely furnishes an adequate treatment of the alleged doctrine of international eminent domain in its possible bearing upon American intervention on the Isthmus of Panama. A bibliography covering thirty-eight pages omits a distinctive part of the title of the important Colombian source collection concerning the Panama Revolution and canal diplomacy, the *Libro Azul*. The *Diario Oficial* of Colombia is not even listed in the bibliography.

As a piece of pioneer work in inter-American relations, this monograph will be very useful to students of diplomatic history and international relations. In some particulars, however, it is not an exemplar of what an elaborated doctoral dissertation should be. Its footnotes seem to indicate that little use was made of the official gazette of Colombia, which contains a rich store of documents concerning her diplomacy. More than once the name of the Colombian diplomatic agent, José R. Revenga, is given as "Ravenga". The language employed in the book is not always felicitous. It is to be regretted

that the author did not send to the press a better proportioned and more scholarly study of our relations with the enterprising republic founded by Bolivar, Santander, and their compatriots.

The University of Illinois. WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON.

Joel R. Poinsett, Versatile American. By J. FRED RIPPY. [Duke University Publications.] (Durham: Duke University Press. 1935. Pp. xii, 257. $3.00.)

Joel Roberts Poinsett: a Political Biography. By HERBERT EVERETT PUTNAM, Assistant Professor of History, University of Vermont. (Washington: Mimeoform Press. 1935. Pp. iii, 240. $2.00.)

IN spite of an exceedingly active career and a large share of contemporary attention, Joel R. Poinsett was soon lost to fame. Though many of his papers became available at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania over fifty years ago, they attracted the interest of only a local scholar who published a magazine sketch of Poinsett in 1888. Within the last decade, however, two studies of his diplomatic career have appeared and more recently the two biographies under review. Now there can be no mistaking the Jeffersonian versatility of the man; for we see him not only as a diplomat, a politician, and an office-holder, but as a farmer, an amateur scientist, and a far-traveled wanderer as well.

His life story illumines three phases of our early national history. The first of these was the initiation of relations between the United States and Latin America. When revolution broke out in the Spanish Empire in 1810, he was sent thither to investigate and to encourage independence. He did both, even leading the Chilean rebels in battle, but was forced to return home with little of specific achievement except that which was undiplomatic. When some years later he was appointed first minister to Mexico, he found it his task to combat predominant British influence in the name of democracy. This he did, again in his own direct fashion, by interfering in local politics to such an extent that his diplomacy was in the main ineffective.

His second major role proved to be that of leader of the Union forces in the nullification struggle which troubled South Carolina during the famous tariff controversy. His wide travel had given him a broad outlook unusual in South Carolina, and he had developed an ardent national feeling. Encouraged by President Jackson, he endeavored to arouse a martial Union spirit, and in the meantime the threatened disaster was avoided by compromise. Just how potent the efforts of Poinsett and his friends were in producing this result is not disclosed. It is to be regretted that neither author solves this problem.

Poinsett's most effective service was as Secretary of War under Van Buren. He attacked the problems of an inadequate army and the control of the Indians with vigor and intelligence. His wide experience in Europe and his keen military interest stood him in good stead. He made intelligent plans based in part on studies of the best European practice. He was able to

promote valuable improvements in the artillery, and his urging, vigorously seconded by a British war scare on the Canadian border, brought an increase in the army. His Indian program, however, was complicated by the misfortunes of the Seminole War. Not the least of his achievements was his uniformly friendly relations with the ever-difficult General Scott.

Both biographies are written from substantially the same material, and each author had access to the work of the other. Professor Rippy came upon Mr. Poinsett as he was writing his books, *The United States and Mexico* and *Rivalry of the United States and Great Britain in Latin America, 1808-1830*. Professor Putnam used Poinsett as the subject of his doctoral dissertation. In his researches he confined himself largely to the Poinsett manuscripts in the possession of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and to printed material. Rippy's research supplements these sources with the manuscript records in the State and War departments and in the British Public Record Office. However, the Mexican diplomatic correspondence had been published, and Rippy's findings in the British archives had already been reduced to print, thus giving Putnam much of this material. After Putnam finished, Rippy had the use of Putnam's manuscript before completing his own, and he acknowledges his obligations very frankly in his preface. As Rippy says, he is indebted "for not a few ideas and, in some instances, perhaps for almost [Putnam's] very phrasings which unwittingly may have been reproduced". As a matter of fact, there are numerous duplications of phrase and extensive close paraphrasings as well as similar outlines of paragraphs and chapters.

Both tell substantially the same story. Both emphasize diplomacy, which is their special interest. Neither author is satisfactory on local and national politics, where more widely extended research and more thoughtful consideration are still needed. Each book shows marks of hasty composition. Rippy, the more mature scholar and the more facile writer, has a clearer conception of the meaning of biography. Putnam risks few generalities, but Rippy has a well-developed enthusiasm for his subject. He concludes with the hope that someday "Poinsett may occupy the place he deserves among South Carolina's greatest sons, and perhaps at the head of them all in vision and versatility". Vision and versatility he had, but in the opinion of this reviewer greatness would have produced a more substantial achievement.

The University of Pennsylvania. ROY F. NICHOLS.

Guarding the Frontier: a Study of Frontier Defense from 1815 to 1825. By EDGAR BRUCE WESLEY, Associate Professor of Education, University of Minnesota. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1935. Pp. xi, 217. $2.50.)

The Western Military Frontier, 1815-1846. By HENRY PUTNEY BEERS. (Gettysburg: News Publishing Company. 1935. Pp. vi, 227. $2.00.)

PROFESSOR Wesley's volume has a wider scope than the title suggests. Of

the twelve chapters, three deal with the subjects of Indian agents, the factory system, and the fur trade; two, with national military policy and army administration. The remaining seven chapters treat of the problems of the frontier, the pacification of the tribes after the War of 1812, and the history of the various sectors of the frontier during the decade following the war. Why 1825 was chosen as the terminal date is not altogether apparent. The study of Dr. Beers shows that most of the problems and policies originating in that period persisted for many years thereafter.

Professor Wesley has made use of a great quantity of unpublished material, especially from the War Department, the Indian Office, and the Missouri Historical Society. He presents many fresh facts, for the most part well organized, and writes with evident enthusiasm for his subject. The one exception is the chapter on the Florida frontier, where little of the material is new, and where, perhaps for that reason, the treatment seems perfunctory. With the exception of a lingering distrust of the British on the north and friction with the Spanish on the south, the frontier problems of the period related exclusively to the Indian tribes. Professor Wesley has exhibited clearly the interrelations of trade, diplomacy, humanitarian concern for the Indians, and the employment of the military arm. The difficulties of harmonizing the activities of Indian agents, factors, and army officers, and the frequent and perplexing conflicts of jurisdiction among the various representatives of the government are clearly brought out. The chapter on the factory system contains interesting information on the collision of this early experiment in "government in business" with the interests of private traders and trading companies, ending in the complete triumph of the latter.

Dr. Beers's study makes no attempt to deal systematically with the economic side of frontier policy. On the military side, it obviously overlaps with the Wesley volume but has the advantage of carrying the story to a better chosen stopping place—the eve of the Mexican War. The chief element that entered the picture after 1825 was the removal of the southern Indians to lands beyond the Mississippi. The settling of these tribes in their new home added greatly to the burdens of the army, since the immigrants required protection against the original occupants of the territory. Dr. Beers traces the gradual pushing outward of the military frontier until, at the close of his period, it consisted of a line of posts stretching from Lake Superior via Forts Snelling and Leavenworth to Corpus Christi, Texas. Throughout the period, a systematic handling of frontier problems was often frustrated by the unsympathetic attitude of Congress. To the student of military history it seems amazing that the patrolling of the long frontier was entrusted exclusively to infantry from the disbanding of the rangers in 1815 until 1832, when a new corps of rangers was authorized, to be replaced the next year by the creation of the first regiment of dragoons.

Both volumes are supplied with maps and with adequate bibliographies

and indexes. A critical reader will perhaps feel that Dr. Beers's study contains a good deal of poorly digested detail.

The University of Buffalo. JULIUS W. PRATT.

The United States and Europe, 1815-1823: a Study in the Background of the Monroe Doctrine. By EDWARD HOWLAND TATUM, JR. (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1936. Pp. x, 315. $3.00.)

DR. Tatum's book is written exclusively from published materials without reference to any archives, even those of the Department of State in Washington. Nonetheless, the author brings forward with great confidence an entirely new interpretation of the origins of the Monroe Doctrine. His central thesis is that the famous pronouncement was directed, not against the Continental European powers, but against Great Britain, and especially against the possible threat to the island of Cuba from the aggressive designs of the government at London.

The reviewer, after the most careful and candid consideration of the evidence, is unable to accept this conclusion. That there existed in 1823 suspicions as to British designs on the Queen of the Antilles, that there had existed such suspicions in previous years, is undeniable, and as a matter of fact, a by no means novel discovery. Dr. Tatum masses some new and interesting evidence on the point, but on the basis of this he generalizes in a manner which does not carry conviction. Assuming that relations between the United States and Great Britain were bitter in the extreme, and that they grew in bitterness as the period advanced (p. 83), he concludes that the culmination of this feeling lay in the message of 1823.

As a matter of fact, it cannot be stated that Anglo-American relations were by any means uniformly bad in this eight year period between the Peace of Ghent and the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine. It is possible, of course, to marshal much evidence, especially from such British periodicals as the *Quarterly* and the *Edinburgh Review,* on the one side, and *Niles' Register* and the *National Intelligencer,* on the other, which reveals the jealousy of the two peoples. It is possible to point to evidences of envy and tension in the communications of diplomats. But even in the early part of the period, there are such striking examples of a different spirit as the Great Lakes agreement of 1817, the convention of 1818 with regard to Oregon, and the expressed desire of the American government to go hand in hand with England in the Latin-American question. It would be absurd, of course, to assume on this basis that the two governments saw eye to eye on everything, or that there was not always in Anglo-American relations an evil tradition and an element of distrust; but it is equally absurd to stress only the other side.

Moreover, it can be asserted beyond fear of contradiction that the relations of the two chancelleries improved in 1823. "The course which you have taken in the great politics of Europe", wrote Stratford Canning to his cousin

in a private letter of May 8, 1823, "has had the effect of making the English almost popular in the United States. The improved tone of public feeling is very perceptible, and even Adams has caught a something of the soft infection." Adams's own language bears out the point. Indeed he specifically proposed to Canning a general understanding "with a view to the accommodation of great interests on which they had hitherto differed". He not only, as early as June, 1823, pointed out the identity of interest on the South American question, but also suggested negotiations on the slave trade, on the question of trade with the British American colonies, and on such more remote matters as the principles of maritime law and neutral rights (London, P. R. O., F. O., America, vol. 176, no. 56). Nor did these overtures stand alone. In May Adams had proposed joint action with Great Britain against the Russian pretensions on the northwest coast. In 1824 he attempted the liquidation of the Oregon question and arrived at an understanding with regard to the suppression of the slave trade (though the treaty failed of ratification at the hands of the American Senate). A still more striking evidence of the *détente* in Anglo-American relationships in 1823 is the attitude of the Cabinet towards Canning's suggestion of joint action in the Latin-American question. Monroe was willing, in the first stages of the Cabinet discussions of the fall of 1823, to give Rush a discretionary power to join in a declaration against the interference of the Holy Allies, and even went so far as to modify Adams's draft of instructions to Rush so as not to close the door to co-operation. In the next year, when an appeal came from Colombia against the possibility of French hostility, even Adams favored an understanding with Great Britain in such a contingency. In view of all these facts, Dr. Tatum's insistence that hostility to Great Britain was the reigning passion of Monroe and his advisers seems to be lacking in cogency.

But it is even more difficult to understand his contention that President Monroe's message was specifically directed against England. That there was anxiety as to Cuba is true. But the language of the famous pronouncement hardly admits of more than one construction. It is the political system of "the allied powers" which Monroe excoriates. It is an attempt "on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere" which he declares to be "dangerous to our peace and safety". It is the governments which have declared their independence, *not* Cuba, with regard to which he declares that "any interposition with the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny" would be regarded as "the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States". It is the "allied powers" who are informed that they could not "extend their political system to any portion of our continent" "without endangering our peace and happiness". Would it not be only by a most desperately forced construction that such language could be thought to apply to Great Britain? And what of the debates in the Cabinet? Dr. Tatum makes great play of the general relations between the United States and France and Russia, and of news-

paper citations and earlier diplomatic correspondence, to show that there could be no fear of either of these European powers on the part of the United States. This may have been true in June of 1823, but not in the fall. We know, in Adams's own words, that Monroe was "alarmed far beyond anything I could have conceived possible" (Adams, *Memoirs,* VI, 185), and that Calhoun was "moon-struck" (*ibid.,* p. 186). Even Adams, who, on the whole, kept his head, regarded the challenge to the Alliance as a "fearful question" (*ibid.,* p. 202). It is true that we know today that the danger was illusory; but is it not clear that Canning's warning as to the projected congress, the French success in Spain, and the vague idealism of the czar produced a genuine disquietude in Washington? Who can read the debates in the Cabinet and believe otherwise—except Dr. Tatum?

That the non-colonization clause in the pronouncement of December 2, 1823, had reference to Great Britain as well as to Russia, has long been accepted. Dr. Tatum makes little of this point, but even were he disposed to do so, it would not affect the bearing of the Latin-American portion of the message. Nor can evidences that even at this time Rush and Adams retained a healthy distrust of Great Britain convince a careful analyst that the message itself was leveled against her.

The plain truth of the matter is that Dr. Tatum has erected his new thesis on very unsound foundations. He has attempted to force the facts; and on the perfectly obvious premise that distrust and dislike of Britain were not absent from Anglo-American relations in 1823, he erects a conclusion which is more remarkable for its novelty than for its persuasiveness.

This is not to say that Dr. Tatum's book has no contribution to make. He should have been less anxious to revolutionize American diplomatic history; but he has, even so, produced a series of interesting essays on the relations of the United States with Europe in a period well worth his explorations, and he undeniably does something to illuminate the background of the message of 1823. He sheds new and interesting light on American public opinion in relation to the Holy Alliance and on the views of European diplomats towards the United States, especially for the years just after 1815. He has often made skillful use of the published materials at his command; his literary style is excellent. It is a pity that his volume attempts to prove so much more than it is possible to prove, and that, in his anxiety to make his point, he has neglected the great mass of materials that militates against his conclusions.

The University of Rochester. DEXTER PERKINS.

Deutschland und die Vereinigten Staaten in der Weltpolitik. Von ALFRED VAGTS. Zwei Bände. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. xxii, 938; 939-2030. $16.00.)

THIS is a Trojan study of German-American relations from 1890 to 1906, passed through the screen of economic determinism. It is a difficult book

to read, because of its overvoluminousness and because of the Heidelbergian convolutions of a complex and inartistic style. It is the most lengthy and thorough work thus far written on any phase of the diplomatic history of the United States, if one excludes the documentary collections of Henri Doniol and John Bassett Moore, and it is a contribution of major importance. The author has exploited in great detail the archives of the German foreign office and other minor German archives and those of the Department of State in Washington, together with personal papers like those of Holls, Villard, Olney, Roosevelt, Hay, and Andrew D. White, and a great variety of printed sources. He has used nearly all—but not all (for example, Lester B. Shippee's notable article in this *Review* on Germany and the Spanish-American War and the valuable articles by Julius W. Pratt on big business and the Spanish-American War)—of the special studies which touch the subject and a vast variety of ancillary sociological literature. He has not been able to examine the British archives for this period; and because of this his study, despite its encyclopedic character, cannot be altogether definitive; but it will not be done over again. Great Britain, as the author doubtless appreciates, is one of the keys to a thorough understanding of German-American relations. Its foreign office archives remain closed after 1888.

The book is written in German, printed in London, and published in the United States, presumably for purposes of economy. For American readers it is unfortunate that it is written in German, because, like Doniol, it is too long to be republished in translation. The advertising jacket, in English, says what the author stresses in his preface, that the work departs from the formalistic methods of conventional diplomatic history, restricted to official notes and conversations, to relations between foreign offices and sets of diplomats, as the sum total of foreign affairs; it presents the whole economic and sociological development of each people as it impinges on the other politically. We may say that this is true insofar as the thought and inquiries of the author are concerned, but his method is not new or different, despite its thoroughness. His principal sources remain the diplomatic sources; even his wealth of German newspaper citations comes from the enclosures to diplomatic correspondence. It is his philosophy of economic determinism, approached without bias even though from a Marxian point of view, which gives the new tone and quickening to his laborious and valuable work.

The first century of German-American relations, which Count Stolberg has so capably covered in his one-volume scholarly and readable study, *Deutschland und die Vereinigten Staaten im Zeitalter Bismarcks,* was on the whole a hundred years of serenity. There had developed a pleasant affinity between the two peoples, based on many similarities of culture and institutions: Protestantism, federalism, liberalism, the non-parliamentary cabinet system, bicameral legislatures, the struggle for national unity, contemporary industrial development, emancipation from English influence, and

the pervasive common factor of German immigration into the United States. Toward the end of the century, where Vagts begins his voluminous sequel to Stolberg's concise work, this affinity was disappearing, despite studied efforts to preserve it, before the colliding economic forces of industrialism and imperialism, the latter accompanied by naval rivalry. Conflicts in tariff policy, standards of living, currency and industrial systems (all these are examined at great length in the first volume) were bringing Germany and the United States into the arena of world politics as adversaries. It next became the habit of German and American naval authorities to measure their strength hypothetically against each other and to build against each other. Germany became the potential foe of the United States, and vice versa.

The author does not explain American imperialism from an exclusively economic point of view. Much of it was due to psychological exhiliration embodied in the adventurous and sporting personality of President Theodore Roosevelt. German imperialism was due to economic forces, but more to the "feudal" direction of German diplomacy, under an officialdom dominated by the great landed interests particularly in Prussia. This political direction of the *Junkers* was personified in the Kaiser, Baron von Holstein, and Prince von Bülow. Holstein is, justly we think, the *bête noir* of this book. For him the author reserves his most caustic passages: a feudal diplomat, unacquainted with the realities of those foreign countries which it was his profession to know and understand, wrapped in the lucubrations of a back-chamber habitat into which no light of day could reach, a diplomat utterly unresponsive to modern social forces. German capital rather nervelessly fell in line with this feudal diplomacy and the armament industry which throve on it. The socialists remained indecisive and compromising toward militaristic capitalism, hoping to remove the latter without destroying the social order. In both countries, but more surely in Germany, thinks the author, imperialism was impelled by forceful minorities of capital (armament dealers, capitalistic press, and, in the case of Germany, a feudal bureaucratic *élite*), minorities which capital in its broader levels was too cowardly to oppose.

It is the author's conviction, like that of so many Germans since the war, that Germany made a fundamental mistake in policy in thrusting out her forces overseas, instead of consolidating her power and expanding it on land, where she was unbeatable. Her overseas imperialism brought her into collision with England and with the United States—this was her downfall. If German politicians and diplomats had known better the history of the English-speaking countries, perhaps they might have avoided this almost fatal mistake.

After reading such a formidable and voluminous work as this, one may well ask: What new does it contribute to the history of German-American relations as known since the publication of the diplomatic correspondence printed in the *Grosse Politik* series? The author thinks that the principle

of selection of documents for that great series, which he pronounces to be honestly and thoroughly edited, does not conduce to a full understanding of German-American relations. He has gone behind the printed documents both in the United States and in Germany; he stresses in an instructive way the economic conflict between the German agrarian interests and the American protective tariff system; but what new light does he throw? It may be said that he illumines many a crook and cranny hitherto in the shadows of historical obscurity, but the broad corridors and principal passages had already been trodden by such American scholars as Jeannette Keim, Lester B. Shippee, J. Fred Rippy, A. L. P. Dennis, and Tyler Dennett. The wealth of detail is highly welcome to the specialist on American diplomatic history, who must read the entire book, but it will not greatly change the picture of German-American relations. It is the author's persistent economic interpretation that counts and that will cause the book to be discussed in future years.

Among the new details are the revelation of the persistent interest of the German admiralty, under Tirpitz, in securing naval bases in the Caribbean and Central America, on both sides of the Isthmus, and in the Galapagos Islands. Tirpitz wanted a string of naval and cable stations: Virgin Islands-Curaçao-Isthmus-Galápagos-Samoa-Kiaochow. The Kaiser was most sympathetic, but thought that more naval force was necessary to secure it. "Ships, ships, more ships!" he noted on the memoranda. The foreign office would not challenge the Monroe Doctrine for the admiralty; and after the Anglo-Russian entente the admiralty itself abandoned the idea of distant naval stations in all parts of the world in favor of a concentration of its forces in the North Sea. We may conclude that Germany's action in Venezuela in 1902, in which Great Britain joined without invitation (along with Italy), was a feeler to test the Monroe Doctrine, after Theodore Roosevelt had led the Germans to believe there would be no objection to a course of action against Venezuela which would lead to no "permanent occupation".

Vagts examines with great thoroughness Roosevelt's later claim that he chased the Germans out of Venezuela with an ultimatum. He can find absolutely no evidence of this either in Germany or in the United States and concludes that it was the rising tone of the American press which decided Germany to accept the suggestion of the United States for arbitration. Unjustly Vagts says the American historians have declared a "closed season" on all discussion of Venezuela. This is scarcely true; they had merely exhausted the hunting-grounds and already had come in general to pretty much the same conclusion. Vagts also shows that there is grave doubt about the truth of Theodore Roosevelt's famous assertion to Spring-Rice in 1906 that he warned France and Germany not to meddle in the Russo-Japanese War or the United States would interfere. A latent German hostility to the Pan-American policy of the United States is also revealed. The three hundred pages on the

Samoan question (1889-1899), based on the German and the American archives but not on the British, which are closed, in themselves present a most important contribution.

Little new light is thrown on the Far East, despite a wealth of detail. We already knew about the Manila Bay incident and German policy toward the Spanish islands, from Shippee's painstaking article, based on the *Grosse Politik*. Curiously Vagts does not mention the part which the British squadron played when it sailed in between the German fleet and Dewey's line of battle during the bombardment of the forts at Manila. The name of Captain Chichester does not even appear.

A reviewer has the duty of pointing out occasional errors in fact, not to be unexpected in a work of this magnitude of detail. The author is mistaken in assuming that the election of 1900 gave a mandate for imperialism; the recent researches of Merle Curti and T. A. Bailey have shaken this persistent idea. W. R. Thayer was not a "Harvard Professor". The author appears not to know of the Englishman Hippisley and his relation to the Open Door policy (revealed by A. L. P. Dennis and Tyler Dennett). He is mistaken in saying that McKinley's message of April 11, 1898, to Congress was "without mention of the last-hour concession of Spain". Hay's sounding of Japan as to an American naval base in Fukien, presented as an original discovery not mentioned by Hay's biographers, is well known (see Morse and MacNair, or E. T. Williams). No satisfactory evidence has yet turned up (not ignoring the Paschall letter discovered by Vagts) to support the suggestive characterization of Cleveland's Venezuela policy of 1895-1896 as an "anti-European diversion of the American social conflict".

While the author certainly tries to be objective, and succeeds, we think, about as well as anybody can hope to, it is nevertheless noticeable that occasionally he holds up the unsupported utterance of some jingoistic naval officer, or other obscure individual, as proof of an American aggressive imperialistic policy without emphasizing more authentic evidence to the contrary; at the same time he sometimes fails to stress similar statements by the very leaders of German policy—for example, he does not quote the Kaiser's famous "Hun speech" made to Count Waldersee on his departure with the expeditionary force for China in 1900.

One has a feeling that the author not only took multitudinous notes during his prodigious researches, but that he used nearly all of them in his book. Certainly it could have been adequately written in much less than its present length. Stolberg's single volume covered satisfactorily a century of German-American relations. Vagt's massive volumes will remain a monumental but heavy exhibition of formidable scholarship, from which specialists will draw off information that will finally filter down in distilled form to the world of historical scholarship. This is doubtless the author's purpose.

The index is scanty. There is no bibliography, but there are about 10,000

footnotes. There are a good many but not an abnormal number of insignificant errors of proofreading, doubtless due to the manner in which the work was published.

Yale University. SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS.

Crusaders of the Jungle. By J. FRED RIPPY and JEAN THOMAS NELSON. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1936. Pp. x, 401. $3.50.)

THIS volume, by Professor J. Fred Rippy of the University of Chicago and the late Jean Thomas Nelson, traces in broad outline the origin, growth, and decline of the principal missions on the frontiers of tropical South America during the colonial period. It is based largely upon the reports of the missionaries themselves and upon other contemporary material, is fully documented, and is decidedly interesting as well as instructive. Unusual vividness is given to the narrative by inclusion of numerous illustrative incidents and by frequent quotation from writings of the crusaders. Chapter V, which describes the subtleties employed to attract the Indians to the mission stations, is especially illuminating.

Some of the impressions left by the book seem, however, slightly misleading. For instance, though the authors state that the missionaries in their reports exaggerated the debased condition of the wild Indians, their own conclusions seem to have been reached without making allowance for such exaggeration. The work also assumes that all, or practically all, of the aborigines within the South American tropics came directly under missionary influence; but this view is very questionable. However, it apparently led the authors to conclude that the expulsion of the Jesuits and the wars for independence were more completely destructive of the work of the missionaries than was actually the case. Though, when the breakup came, even the aborigines who had lived on the *reducciones* for some time quickly cast aside the burdensome clothing and the little-understood theology which had been forced upon them, they probably found useful many of the crafts learned from the white man and continued to practice them in their freer jungle lives. Tribes lacking such borrowings apparently had had little or no contact with the missionaries. These are, however, minor flaws in a volume which gives much sound information upon a subject hitherto neglected.

There is a good index but no bibliography. The symbolical headpieces and decorative initials at the beginnings of the chapters are attractive and seem entirely legitimate in such a volume. But the present reviewer believes that not many historians will approve the numerous illustrative drawings within the text, which, Professor Rippy explains in the preface, "are not intended to be exact representations, but rather the artist's conception of what might have been". Even though these were made "after considerable research into the historical background of the period", they belong in a

novel rather than in a scholarly book dealing with facts. Introduction of such imaginative material tends to undermine the standards of historical scholarship laboriously built up during the past century.

Goucher College. MARY WILHELMINE WILLIAMS.

NOTICES OF OTHER RECENT PUBLICATIONS

GENERAL HISTORY

Atti del III congresso nazionale di studi romani. Edited by C. GALASSI PALUZZI. Five volumes. [Istituto di studi romani.] (Bologna, Licinio Cappelli, 1934 and 1935, pp. xxx, 613; 470; 198; 461; 163, 200 l.) These volumes contain a record of the proceedings of the congress and more than two hundred essays on various aspects of the history, the art, the literature, and the law of Rome from ancient to contemporary times.

Transactions of the Royal Historical Society. Fourth Series. Volume XVIII. (London, the Society, 1935, pp. vii, 255.) Professor Powicke has recently been investigating the history of Simon de Montfort's family after the battle of Evesham. In his presidential address before the Royal Historical Society last year, entitled "Guy de Montfort, 1265-71", he presented some of the results of his study. This appears as the first paper in the latest volume of the *Transactions* of the Society. The other papers are "Russia and Panslavism in the Eighteen-Seventies" by B. H. Sumner, "Faversham and the Cinque Ports" by Miss K. M. E. Murray, "The Jacobite Activities in South and West England in the Summer of 1715" by Sir Charles Petrie, "The Inquisitorial Archives as a Source of English History" by Cecil Roth, "Pierre d'Ailly and the Council of Constance" by Agnes E. Roberts, and "The Unreformed Diplomatic Service, 1812-1860" by S. T. Bindoff.

The Doctor in History. By HOWARD W. HAGGARD. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1934, pp. xiii, 408, $3.75.) This is one of the most readable and reliable of the general accounts of the history of medicine which have been written for intelligent laymen. Indeed, it is more than this—it is a history of health, in which medicine plays an important but not an exclusive role. Dr. Haggard has been unusually successful, throughout the greater part of the study, in presenting picturesque details against a background of the main trends in medical development. He has dramatized without distorting, which is no mean achievement and the best sort of popularization. A number of critical comments may be made. In several places, the author repeats traditional historical generalizations which are open to question. It is observed, for example (p. 373), that no one dreamed that bacteria played any part in human affairs "until late in the nineteenth century". This overlooks the observations and speculations of well-known medical leaders early in that century and during the two preceding ones as well. Perhaps the most essential criticism is that the main trends in medical evolution are rather confused in the treatment of the recent period since about 1860. This is to some extent inevitable, because of the increasing complexity of the whole story of contemporary development.

RICHARD H. SHRYOCK.

Europe since 1870. By PRESTON WILLIAM SLOSSON. With a Foreword by JAMES T. SHOTWELL. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1935, pp. xiii, 810, $4.25.) Among the many books that have been written in an effort to fit into a unified design the tangle of events in Europe since 1870, this work stands in the first rank. The chapter on the Paris Peace Conference is the most competent short account that

can be found in any book in any language; the chapter on the world depression is carefully put together and accomplishes about all that a writer could accomplish without going into the difficult intricacies of monetary theory. The flow of thought that runs from chapter to chapter is smooth, and that great problem of the historian of the period—the problem of what to leave out—has been well handled. Along with the suggestion that the present age may be known to the future as an "age of dictatorships" there is an analysis of the phenomenon of dictatorship that takes high rank. Those familiar with other works by Professor Slosson will not be surprised to find that the interplay of economics with politics is kept clearly in the picture at all times. A question that brings to light the character of a book in this field can always be put: "How much of the historical material selected for presentation is broken down into national history compartments?" Professor Slosson's book meets this test with a score of thirteen chapters out of thirty. More than half of its material deals with Europe as a whole; and of the chapters devoted to national histories, there are several—like that on Italian Fascism—which are really analyses of a problem of general import in terms of the experience of one nation. The bibliography is well selected for teaching purposes. Most of the books, as is proper in the case, are in English.

ROBERT C. BINKLEY.

The Post-War World. By J. HAMPDEN JACKSON. (Boston, Little, Brown, 1935, pp. x, 436, $2.50.) This account of postwar politics stands well above the average of the many works of its type. Much of the material seems to be a selection from Toynbee's surveys of international affairs. The writer has shown a feeling for the drama and movement of the times but is really a novice in the analysis of the economic and financial aspect of recent world affairs. Still, despite the naïveté of his discussion of the causes of the world depression, he has had the dramatic sense to see its place as a great world movement comparable only to the World War itself as a dividing line between epochs.

ROBERT C. BINKLEY.

ARTICLES

W. R. INGE. Historicism and Religion. *History*, Mar.

T. WILLIAMS. The Place of Economic History in the Teaching of History: a Discussion. *Ibid.*, June.

HILDA JOHNSTONE. History and Art. *Contemp. Rev.*, Apr.

MARC BLOCH. Les paysages agraires: Essai de mise au point. *An. Hist. Ec. et Soc.*, May.

Id., LUCIEN FEBVRE, and the COMTE DE NEUFBOURG. Les noblesses: I. Reconnaissance générale du terrain: II. Projet d'une enquête sur la noblesse française. *Ibid.*

IRMA HOYT REED. The European Hard-Paste Porcelain Manufacture of the Eighteenth Century. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Sept.

ANCIENT HISTORY

T. R. S. Broughton

Hellas and Hellenism. By N. P. VLACHOS. (Boston, Ginn, 1936, pp. 428, $3.00.) In this textbook the author aims to present Hellenism as a social phenomenon centering in the organization and life of the Periclean city-state. Hence his review of historical events is somewhat curtailed, and later Hellenism is ignored. Chapters on the city-state, religion, morality, literature, philosophy, art, and architecture round out a view of the best things of the Periclean age. If the author has said too little of the inability of the Greeks to realize their ideals, his historical review shows that he is not unaware of many of their

weaknesses. He does not forget the extent to which old customs and prejudices lasted into the age of enlightenment or the limitations upon personal freedom which were accepted without question in even the freest of the Greek cities.

Die Alexandergeschichte des Königs Ptolemaios I von Aegypten. By E. KORNEMANN. (Leipzig, Teubner, 1935, 10 M.) By comparing a group of Arrian's citations and probable quotations from the history of Alexander which his officer Ptolemy wrote in his old age, Kornemann attempts to establish a group of literary and factual criteria by which to isolate all the material in Arrian which is derived from Ptolemy. Hence the main body of his study consists of a detailed analysis of the text of Arrian and a putative reconstruction of an epitome of Ptolemy's work. This enables the author to draw conclusions which, if true, are of considerable interest regarding the form and compass of Ptolemy's work and particularly regarding his view of Alexander. Kornemann finds this last to be the one proper to a Macedonian noble who followed and admired Alexander but still viewed him from the standpoint of Macedonian political and military feeling. The attempt to reconstruct Ptolemy's work is not without value, but it must be considered as tentative only, for its basis is unsafe. Dependence upon other than literary criteria involves the danger of circular argument, and how can we be sure that Arrian, the rival of Xenophon, is giving Ptolemy's exact words even where he cites him specifically for his material?

Senate & Provinces, 78–49 B. C.: Some Aspects of the Foreign Policy and Provincial Relations of the Senate during the Closing Years of the Roman Republic. By J. MACDONALD COBBAN. [Thirlwall Prize Essay, 1935.] (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1935, pp. xii, 218, $3.00.) Mr. Cobban's purpose "is to discuss the position of the Senate under the Sullan régime, and the factors which influenced its policy as an imperial power" (p. xi). The Sullan senate was not, he contends, the stillborn failure imagined by later historians. Its personnel, its motives, and its work set a high standard. Its task was facilitated by certain favorable conditions. It could and did assert its authority over all affairs, home and foreign, and control all magisterial action, even that of the consuls, until Caesar showed (59 B. C.) how it could be flouted. Little affected by public opinion, imperialistic appetite, or commercial interests, the fathers followed a foreign policy based on a desire for peace with honor and a reluctance to increase their responsibilities. Intent on giving the provinces a sound administration, they consistently endeavored to check the power of the governors (a chapter is devoted to this topic). And far from wishing to make new conquests, they cultivated a decent regard for the sovereign rights of the client-states. In the end, however, they succumbed before the unholy alliance between the financial interests of the equites and the personal ambition of Pompey. Lucullus's recall was the senate's defeat. The book ends with a favorable evaluation of the provincial rule as seen by a provincial. Mr. Cobban is too modest when he disclaims all originality for this essay. His rehabilitation of the "much-maligned" Sullan senate is moderate enough. This is not saying that it is convincing. Its validity rests upon the cumulative effect of a series of appraisals rather than upon incontrovertible factual evidence. Good use is made of recent historical literature. VINCENT SCRAMUZZA.

Auguste, 63 av. J.-C.—14 ap. J.-C. By LÉON HOMO. [Bibliothèque historique.] (Paris, Payot, 1935, pp. 330, 25 fr.) In this, as in his other books, Professor Homo writes with Gallic clarity and logic. No one will disagree with him when

he portrays Augustus as alone the fashioner of the principate. The majority of writers, ancient and modern, likewise doubt, with him, the sincerity of Augustus's declared program of the "Restored Republic". Professor Homo describes how, in virtue of the *imperium maius*, he controlled not only his own provinces but those of the senate and even Italy and Rome; how the creation of the equestrian administrative posts struck a blow at the senate's previous monopoly of the government; and how even admission to the republican offices and the senate was in the hands of the emperor. Nevertheless, despite the weight of authority on Professor Homo's side, the present reviewer feels that a case can be made for the sincerity of Augustus. In so short and general a book, the author must make many positive statements at which specialists may cavil; *e.g.*, the use of the *imperium* in Italy and Rome, the importance of the defeat of Varus (which the reviewer is glad to have Professor Homo assert in the face of those who deny that Augustus ever seriously intended an Elbe frontier), or the propagandist character of Augustan literature. The general reader, however, will find here an excellent and well-balanced life of Augustus in which the personal and military aspects receive the attention which, with the modern emphasis on social and economic factors, is often denied to them. It may nevertheless be doubted whether this book presents an interpretation sufficiently new or significant to replace for English readers the excellent life by Shuckburgh or the more recent work of Rice Holmes. MASON HAMMOND.

Mithra, Zoroastre, et la préhistoire aryenne du Christianisme. By CHARLES AUTRAN. [Bibliothèque historique.] (Paris, Payot, 1935, pp. 279, 25 fr.) Three theses are set forth in this book: (1) that there was a chalcolithic cult, which extended from Persia to India, out of which the gods Mithra and Siva were developed; (2) that Zoroaster made this Mithra his Ahura Mazda, the monotheistic god of the religion named after him; (3) that Jewish and Christian eschatology were borrowed from Zoroastrianism. Incidentally a number of subsidiary points are urged, such as the coming of the Aegean civilization from the Dravidians of India. In the judgment of the reviewer Autran's methods are unsound, and his theses are not proved. It is quite true that the bull figures largely on the inscribed seals founds at Mohenjo-daro and in the myths and sculptures of the cult of Mithra, but that proves no identity of origin. The bull has figured in the mythology of many agricultural peoples. Further, we know little about the deity of Mohenjo-daro, for the inscriptions found there have not been deciphered. Siva in the Vedic and post-Vedic period in India was a very different deity from Mitra, the sun-god. Ahura, the Vedic Asura and Greek *Ouranos*, was apparently the sky-god and not Mithra. As to eschatology, our knowledge of it in Zoroastrianism comes from the Bundahishn, books dating from the ninth century A.D. Our knowledge of Jewish and Christian eschatology comes from books written between 200 B.C. and 100 A.D. It seems unwarranted to suppose that the latter was influenced by the former. GEORGE A. BARTON.

GENERAL ARTICLES

D. T. RICE. Art History as a Key to Racial Migration. *Antiquity*, June.

W. ANDRAE. The Story of Uruk. *Ibid.*

V. BARTOLETTI. Il re omerico. *Stud. Ital. Filol. Class.*, XII, no. 3.

H. D. WESTLAKE. The Medism of Thessaly. *Jour. Hell. Stud.*, June.

H. SCHAEFER. Die attische Symmachie in zweiten Jahrzehnt ihres Bestehens. *Hermes*, LXXI, no. 1.

H. NEUMANN. Die Politik Athens nach dem Nikiasfrieden und die Datierung des Ostrakismos des Hyperbolus. *Klio*, XXIX, no. 1.

G. H. Stevenson. The Constitution of Theramenes. *Jour. Hell. Stud.*, June.
G. De Sanctis. Atene dopo Ipso e un papiro fiorentino. *Riv. Filol.*, June.
F. W. Walbank. Aratos' Attack on Cynaetha. *Jour. Hell. Stud.*, June.
M. Guarducci. Contributi alla topographia della Creta occidentale. *Riv. Filol.*, June.
S. Žébélev. L'abdication de Pairisadès et la révolution scythe dans le royaume de Bosphore. *Rev. Études Grec.*, Mar.
A. Wilhelm. König Mithradates Eupator und Olbia. *Klio*, XXIX, no. 1.
M. Launey. Base d'un fils de Masinissa à Délos. *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, LIX, no. 1.
J. V. A. Fine. Macedon, Illyria, and Rome. *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXVI, no. 1.
H. H. Scullard. A Note on the Battle of Ilipa. *Ibid.*
E. T. Salmon. Roman Colonization from the Second Punic War to the Gracchi. *Ibid.*
J. Noiville. Les Origines du Natalis Invicti. *Rev. Études Anc.*, June.
J. Gagé. De César à Auguste: Où en est le problème des origines du Principat. *Rev. Hist.*, Apr.
T. Corbishley. Quirinius and the Census: a Re-study of the Evidence. *Klio*, XXIX, no. 1.
R. Syme. Notes sur la legion III^e^ Augusta. *Rev. Études Anc.*, June.
J. H. Thiel. Kaiser Tiberius. *Mnemos*, III, no. 3.
L. Vassili. Nota cronologica intorno all' elezione di Maggioriano. *Riv. Filol.*, June.
J. LeGall. L'itinéraire de Génseric. *Rev. Philol.*, July.
W. Enslin. Zu dem vermuteten Perserfeldzug des Hannibalianus. *Klio*, XXIX, no. 1.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ARTICLES

Robert S. Hardy. The Oriental Institute Archaeological Report on the Near East. *Am. Jour. Semitic Lang. and Lit.*, July.
Kurt Bittel. Beiträge zur kleinasiatischen Archäologie. *Arch. f. Orientf.*, XI, nos. 1-2.
G. Contenau. Les fouilles en Asie Occidentale (1934-1935). *Rev. Arch.*, June.
André Parrot. Les Fouilles de Mari. *Syria*, XVII, no. 1.
L. Lerat. Trouvailles mycéniennes à Delphes. *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, LIX, no. 2.
T. Leslie Shear. The Campaign of 1935. *Hesperia*, V, no. 1.
Id. The Current Excavations in the Athenian Agora. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, Apr.
G. W. Elderkin. An Athenian Maledictory Inscription on Lead. *Hesperia*, V, no. 1.
Sterling Dow. Panathenaic Amphorae from the Hellenistic Period. *Ibid.*
Lucy Talcott. A Stand Signed by Euthymides. *Ibid.*
Arthur W. Parsons. A Roman Water-Mill in the Athenian Agora. *Ibid.*
Oscar Broneer and M. Z. Pease. The Cave on the East Slope of the Acropolis. *Ibid.* no. 2.
Elizabeth Pierce Blegen. News Items from Athens. *Am. Jour. Arch.*, Apr.
Paola Zancani and Umberto Zanotti-Bianco. The Discovery of the Heraion of Hucania. *Ibid.*
A. D. Keramopoullos. Ἀνασκαφαὶ καὶ ἔρευναι ἔν τῇ Ἄνα Μακεδονίᾳ. Ἀρχαιολογικὴ ἐφημερίς. 1933 (published 1935).
A. Grenier. Chronique Gallo-Romaine. *Rev. Études Anc.*, June.
Homer A. Thompson. Pnyx and Thesmophorion. *Hesperia*, V, no. 2.
I. A. Richmond. Roman Verona. *Papers Brit. School Rome*, XIII.
Id. Trajan's Army on Trajan's Column. *Ibid.*
Frederick H. Wilson. The so-called "Magazzini Repubblicani" near Porta Romana at Ostia. *Ibid.*

LITERARY AND EPIGRAPHIC ARTICLES

Max Mühl. Zur Entstehungszeit der Historien des Ephoros. *Klio*, XXIX, no. 1.
Alfred Klotz. Über die Stellung des Cassius Dio unter den Quellen zur Geschichte des Zweiten Punischen Krieges. *Rhein. Museum*, June.
Werner Schur. Nachträgliches zu Sallust. *Klio*, XXIX, no. 1.
F. A. Marx. Aufidius Bassus. *Ibid.*
P. Roussel. Note sur un décret d'Athènes. *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, LIX, no. 2.
Benjamin D. Meritt. The Seventh Metonic Cycle. *Hesperia*, V, no. 2.

F. Chapouthier. Inscriptions antiques gravées sur le roc dans le golfe de Mirabello (Crète). *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, LIX, no. 2.

William Wallace. An Eretrian Proxeny Decree of the Early Fifth Century. *Hesperia*, V, no. 2.

Robert L. Scranton. Inscriptions from Phlius. *Ibid.*

Louis Robert. Études sur les inscriptions et la topographie de la Grèce centrale. *Bull. Corr. Hell.*, LIX, no. 2.

Id. Inscriptions de Lesbos et de Samos. *Ibid.*

Id. Inscription hellénistique de Dalmatie. *Ibid.*

Id. Epigraphica: X.—Inscriptions de Volubilis; XI.—Inscription de Nicée; XII.—Décret de Gela. *Rev. Études Grec.*, Mar.

Jeanne Vanseveren. Inscription d'Ilion. *Rev. Philol.*, July.

W. H. Buckler. C I G 3938, 3952, and 3953f. *Jour. Hell. Stud.*, June.

James H. Oliver. The Sarapion Monument and the Paean of Sophocles. *Hesperia*, V, no. 1.

Franz Miltner. Ein Epigramm aus der Umgebung von Konya. *Wiener Stud.*, LIII, nos. 1-2.

P. Wuilleumier. Inscriptions Latines de Grésy-sur-Isère. *Rev. Études Anc.*, June.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ARTICLES

René Dussaud. Le commerce des anciens Phéniciens à la lumière du "poème des dieux gracieux et beaux". *Syria*, XVII, no. 1.

Julius Jüthner. Zur Geschichte der griechischen Wettkämpfe. *Wiener Stud.*, LIII, nos. 1-2.

Josephine P. Shear. Analytical Table of Coins. *Hesperia*, V, no. 1.

D. A. Alt. Der südliche Endabschnitt der römischen Strasse von Bostra nach Aila. *Zeitsch. Deut. Palästina-Vereins*, LIX, nos. 1-3.

Frederick H. Wilson. Studies in the Social and Economic History of Ostia [I]. *Papers Brit. School Rome*, XIII.

Orsolina Montevecchi. Ricerche di sociologia nei documenti dell' Egitto greco-romano [II]. *Aegyptus*, June.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

G. C. Boyce

Der mitteldeutsche Marco Polo nach der Admonter Handschrift. Edited by Horst von Tscharner. [Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.] (Berlin, Weidmann, 1935, pp. lii, 102, 11 M.) The most important Marco Polo studies of recent years are concerned with textual criticism. Professor Benedetto prepared a remarkable edition of the Travels based on the manuscript fr. 1116. This text was compared critically with all the known early Italian, French, Latin, and Spanish texts to determine, as nearly as possible, the wording of the lost original. Herr von Tscharner continues this work. He has traced the derivation of the earliest German text and has examined all variations to determine their origin. His work is painstakingly done and constitutes a definite contribution to Marco Polo literature. George E. Nunn.

Die Einstige Reichsfeste Grasburg. By Dr. Friedrich Burri. (Archiv des Historischen Vereins des Kantons Bern, Volume XXXIII, no. 1, 1935.) The author of a political history of this small triangular province now provides an archaeological description of the castle derived from the accounts required by the governments of the day and from a study of the existing ruins. From 1218 to 1310 it was an imperial fortification, then came under the dominion of Savoy, and from that time until its abandonment in 1573 was held by a partnership of Bern and Freiburg. The ruins, which have suffered much from removals of

building materials, now belong to the Canton of Bern, and restorations of certain decayed portions were undertaken in 1903 and again in 1930. A résumé of its early history is followed by chapters on the various parts of the fort with inventories of armament and sources of income. Fortunately such accounts have been preserved with only minor breaks in the archives of Turin, Bern, and Freiburg, and these the author has examined with great minuteness and fortified with copious footnotes and fifty-one illustrations. The book is a very scholarly study of a local stronghold and a valuable picture of feudal conditions.

J. M. VINCENT.

Louis d'Orléans, 1372-1407: a Necessary Prologue to the Tragedy of La Pucelle d'Orléans. By F. D. S. DARWIN. (London, John Murray, 1936, pp. xxi, 254, 10*s.* 6*d.*) This is a volume which should appeal to the general reader who has already become somewhat familiar with the main aspects of European history in the early fifteenth century. The scholar will find it of interest, though he will question many of the author's statements. There is evidence of an attempt to rely on the sources available for a critical study of the period and characters concerned. Nevertheless the narrative includes too many passages representing the author's suppositions of what was in the minds and hearts of his actors to be entirely satisfactory. Actors is the correct word, for Mr. Darwin obviously has a sense for the dramatic, a tendency evident in his choice of a subtitle and of chapter and page headings. When historical issues are to be explained and comprehended, a dramatic narrative is not always the clearest narrative, and in this case many sections of the book would have been more clearly and precisely presented had a direct form of exposition been used. Though Louis d'Orléans is the hero—a dubious one in many respects—the volume is also valuable for vivid portraits of the Burgundian dukes, Philip the Bold and John the Fearless, the pitiable Charles VI and his loathsome consort Isabel of Bavaria, the unhappy, yet gracious duchess of Orléans (Valentina Visconti) and her unfortunate children. The list of authorities at the end of the book is arranged according to chapter, paragraph, and, at times, topic. This is a cumbersome and unsatisfactory method in every way and tends to confuse and annoy the reader. There are eight interesting illustrations, a genealogical table, and an unsatisfactory index.

Hanseatene og Norges nedgang. By JOHAN SCHREINER. (Oslo, Steen, 1935.) The problem of the decline of the Norwegian monarchy in the latter Middle Ages has been dealt with from a novel point of view in this work. Schreiner emphasizes the importance of trade relations. The great Hansa had a virtual monopoly of the corn trade in Northern Europe and was therefore able at any time to force the Norwegian state to its knees. LAURENCE M. LARSON.

Bayard, 1476-1524. By PAUL BALLAGUY. [Bibliothèque historique.] (Paris, Payot, 1935, pp. 374, 25 fr.) Another Frenchman pays tribute to Pierre Terrail Bayard, *le bon chevalier!* Brave warrior—descendant of a noble family "nearly every head of which had fallen in battle"—this last representative of medieval chivalry "fought for France" in the various invasions of Italy by the soldiers of King Charles VIII. Later, in 1521, when the tables were turned, and the imperial troops of Charles V were about to conquer central France, Bayard, with an army of 1000 enthusiastic Frenchmen is said to have held back the 35,000 "ruthless" Germans at Mézières and saved his beloved country. This "happy warrior" was also a "perfect knight". He was pious, heroic, generous, kind, selfless, and idealistic—spending time and money, for example, in checking a

devastating pestilence in the province of Dauphiné. "Indeed," claims Mr. Ballaguy, "if all the nobles had been like the chevalier there never would have been a French Revolution." The author may be a little too enthusiastic about his hero. He has, however, written a very readable account of this romantic Frenchman. He has also included in his volume a number of interesting documents relative to the subject. Unfortunately, his *Bibliographie Sommaire* and his citations are quite limited and therefore will not be equally helpful to scholars working in this field. Jacques Bainville of the French Academy, in a preface, has endorsed both the author and the book. FRANKLIN C. PALM.

ARTICLES

LOUIS HALPHEN. Les travaux français sur l'histoire de Rome et de l'Italie au moyen âge depuis le début du XX^e^ siècle. *Mélanges Arch. et Hist.*, 1935, nos. 1-5 [appeared 1936].

Id. Bulletin historique: Le moyen âge jusqu'aux Valois [survey of publications since 1935]. *Rev. Hist.*, Mar.

ROBERT BOUTRUCHE. Bulletin historique: Bordelais, Bazadais, Agenais, Bas-Quercy, 1919 à 1935. *Ibid.*

PAUL LEHMANN. Blätter, Seiten, Spalten, Zeilen [important technical study for users of medieval manuscripts]. *Zentralblatt f. Bibliothekswes.*, July.

JOHANNES VINCKES. Recht und Verfassung in Staat und Kirche. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVI, no. 1.

G. C. HOMANS. Men and the Land in the Middle Ages. *Speculum*, July.

JOHN T. MCNEILL. Asceticism versus Militarism in the Middle Ages. *Church Hist.*, Mar.

LYNN THORNDIKE. Law Advertising in Medieval Manuscripts. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, June.

Id. Alchemical writings in Vatican Palatine and Other Continental Manuscripts. *Speculum*, July.

A. W. BURRIDGE. L'Immaculé Conception dans la théologie d'Angleterre médiévale. *Rev. Hist. Eccles.*, July.

HANS VAN WERKE. Les origines des bourses commerciales: Faut-il abandonner la thèse Guichardin-Ehrenberg? *Rev. Belge Philol. et Hist.*, Jan.

LUIGI CHIAPELLI. La civiltà di un comune medioevale italiano. *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 1936, no. 1.

MAURICE COENS. Anciens litanies des saints. *An. Boll.*, LIV, nos. 1-2.

ALFONS DOPSCH. Freiheitsgarantien für Person und Eigentum im Mittelalter. *Arch. f. Kulturgesch.*, XXVI, no. 1.

HERBERT GRUNDMANN. Die Frauen und die Literatur im Mittelalter: Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der Entstehung des Schrifttums in der Volkssprache. *Ibid.*, no. 2.

RUDOLF SCHREIBER. Die Stellung des mittelalterlichen Elbogener Landes zu Böhmen. *Mitteil. Vereines f. Gesch. der Deutschen in Böhmen*, LXXIV, nos. 1-2.

PIERRE COURCELLE. Boèce et l'école d'Alexandrie. *Mélanges Arch. et Hist.*, 1935, nos. 1-5 [appeared 1936].

H. KOEPPLER. De viris illustribus and Isidore of Seville. *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, Jan.

A. M. SCHNEIDER. Die vorjustinianische Sophienkirche. *Byzant. Zeitsch.*, XXXVI, no. 1.

G. MICKWITZ. Die Organisationsformen zweier byzantinischer Gewerbe im X. Jahrhundert. *Ibid.*

F. DWORSCHAK. Byzantinische Goldbullen. *Ibid.*

L. AUZIAS. Les sièges de Barcelone, de Tortose et d'Huesca, 801–811. *An. Midi*, Jan.

HEINZ ZATSCHEK. Die Reichsteilungen unter Kaiser Ludwig dem Frommen. *Mitteil. Österr. Inst. f. Geschichtsf.*, XLIX, nos. 3-4.

HENRY MORRIS. The Circuit of Ireland by Muirchertach na gCochall gCroiceann, A.D. 941. *Jour. Roy. Soc. Antiquar. Ireland*, June.

EDMUND CURTIS. Some Medieval Seals of the Ormon Archives. *Ibid.*

R. R. DARLINGTON. Ecclesiastical Reform in the Late Old English Period. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, July.

PH. GRIERSON. The Early Abbots of St. Peter's of Ghent. *Rev. Bénédict.*, Apr.

MARSHALL W. BALDWIN. Ecclesiastical Developments in the Twelfth Century Crusaders' State of Tripolis. *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, July.

Léo Strauss. Quelques remarques sur la science politique de Maïmonide et de Fârâbi. *Rev. Études Juives*, Jan.

K. W. Cameron. A Discovery in John de Mandevilles. *Speculum*, July.

Georgia Buckler. Authorship of the Strategikon of Cecaumenus. *Byzant. Zeitsch.*, XXXVI, no. 1.

B. Altaner. Griechische Codices in abendländischen Bibliotheken des XIII. und XIV. Jahrhunderts. *Ibid.*

Hermann Heimpel. Alexander von Roes und das deutsche Selbstbewusstsein des 13. Jahrhunderts. *Arch. f. Kulturgesch.*, XXVI, no. 1.

C. G. Crump. The Pilgrims' Way. *History*, June.

E. Coornaert. Notes sur les corporations parisiennes au temps de Saint Louis. *Rev. Hist.*, Mar.

F. Imle. Das sozial-biologische Moment in der Trinitätsspekulation Alexanders von Hales. *Franz. Stud.*, XXIII, no. 1.

P. A. Landon. The Action on the Case and the Statute of Westminster II. *Law Quar. Rev.*, Jan.

François-Paul Raynal. Un loyal serviteur de Philippe-le-Bel: Pierre Flotte. *Rev. Ques. Hist.*, July.

G. Bigwood. La politique de la laine en France sous les règnes de Philippe le Bel et de ses fils. *Rev. Belge Philol. et Hist.*, Jan.

R. Fawtier. Documents négligés sur l'activité de la chancellerie apostilique à la fin du XIII^{e} siècle: Le registre 46A et les comptes de la Chambre sous Boniface VIII. *Mélanges Arch. et Hist.*, 1935, nos. 1-5 [appeared 1936].

Yves Renouard. Achats et paiements de draps flamands par les premiers papes d'Avignon. *Ibid.*

L. Carolus Barre. Le cardinal de Dormans, chancelier de France, principal conseiller de Charles V. *Ibid.*

Jean Rott. Le grand schisme d'occident et le diocèse de Strasbourg, 1378–1415. *Ibid.*

Marc Bloch. Dans l'Italie du XIV^{e} siècle: Un marchand de petite ville et son destin. *An. Hist. Éc. et Soc.*, May.

G. Salvemini. Florence in the Time of Dante. *Speculum*, July.

F. J. Carmody. Latin Sources of Brunetto Latini's World History. *Ibid.*

T. F. Rich. Giovanni da Sanminiato and Coluccio Salutati. *Ibid.*

J. G. Sikes. A Possible Marsilian Source in Ockham. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, July.

H. Chobaut. Notes sur les Juifs de la principauté d'Orange et sur leurs chartes de libertés du 14 février 1353. *Rev. Études Juives*, Jan.

Gerhard Ritter. Petrus Antonius Finariensis, der Nachfolger Peter Luders in Heidelberg: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Frühumanismus am Oberrhein. *Arch. f. Kulturgesch.*, XXVI, no. 1.

Ernst Kern. Studien zur Geschichte des Augsburger Kaufmannshauses der Höchstetter. *Ibid.*, no. 2.

Harold S. Bender. Conrad Grebel, the First Leader of the Swiss Brethren. *Mennonite Quar. Rev.*, Apr.

Pedro Leturia. La conversión de S. Ignacio: Nuevos datos y ensayo de síntesis. *Arch. Hist. Soc. Iesu*, Jan.

DOCUMENTS

C. Lambot. Les sermons inédits de Saint Augustin dans un homéliaire du Monte-Cassin. *Rev. Bénédict.*, Apr.

G. Morin. Lettres inédites des papes Alexandre II et Saint Grégoire VII. *Ibid.*

C. R. Cheney. A Monastic Letter of Fraternity to Eleanor of Aquitaine. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, July.

Jacqueline Buhot. L'abbaye normande de Savigny, chef d'ordre et fille de Cîteaux. *Moyen Age*, Jan.

Ernst Müller. Der Kampf des Paderborner Domkapitels gegen die päpstlichen Provisionen. *Arch. f. Urkundenforsch.*, XIV, no. 2.

Botho Odebrecht. Die Briefmuster des Henricus Francigena. *Ibid.*

Leo Santifaller. Papsturkunden für das Trientner Domkapitel. *Hist. Jahrb.*, LVI, no. 1.

Euloge Kourilas and François Halkin. Deux vies de S. Maxime le Kausokalybe, ermite au Mont Athos, XIV^e^ S. *An. Boll.*, LIV, nos. 1-2.

H. M. Legros. Le "Thrésor de l'Esglise parroichial de Nostre-Dame d'Alenczon" [cont'd]. *Rev. Ques. Hist.*, May.

E. Déprez. Jérôme Münzer et son voyage dans le midi de la France en 1494–1495. *An. Midi*, Jan.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The United Kingdom and the British Empire

R. L. Schuyler

Lord Brougham. By G. T. Garratt. (London, New York, Macmillan Company, 1935, pp. viii, 354, $5.50.) Henry Brougham, the popular tribune in the England of the 1820's and during the hectic days when the fate of the great reform bill hung in the balance, was shelved politically in 1834, and he remained shelved until his death thirty-four years later. Few men have so outlived their fame, and fewer still have been so completely neglected by a posterity that has reaped where they sowed. Mr. Garratt attempts to right the wrongs done to Brougham. He is successful when he depicts the difficulties which faced Brougham, who had no connections and who was too proud and too gifted to kowtow to the Whig chieftains when he tried successfully to crash the gates of society and of politics; and he shows that Brougham was a real force in the England of the pre-Victorian period and that he rendered services of inestimable value to the cause of reform. But the arguments become labored when attempts are made to discover consistency, a political philosophy, and deeply rooted principles behind the acts of Brougham. Mr. Garratt does not change materially the commonly accepted view of Brougham as a gifted, energetic, and resourceful man, but withal not a wise or a great man. Want of judgment wrecked his career and enabled Lord Melbourne, a little man in a big place, to shelve the "great" Brougham. Mr. Garratt has written a useful but hardly a definitive biography. This can be done only by an author endowed with the industry and the patience necessary for mastering the wealth of manuscript material which Mr. Garratt has neglected. The book contains few errors of commission. It has no bibliography but a good index. Paul Knaplund.

British Policy towards Morocco in the Age of Palmerston, 1830-1865. By Francis Rosebro Flournoy. (London, P. S. King and Son; Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1935, pp. xiii, 287, $2.75.) This book reviews the efforts of Great Britain from 1830 to 1865 to keep Morocco out of serious diplomatic controversies with European powers, and it emphasizes the important part played, with the approval of the Shereefian government, by two British representatives, members of the Drummond Hay family. It was no simple matter to control the uncertain temper of the native populace in such a way as not to precipitate a reaction against England; this the Hays did without seriously offending France, of whose designs in all North Africa England was particularly suspicious, or Spain, of whose aggressive undertakings for territory she disapproved. The dazzling visions of conquest held by both France and Spain form an undertone which runs throughout the book. The author does not minimize the fact that the basis of Britain's interest in Morocco was not so much an unselfish big brother attitude as a desire to keep the Mediterranean safe for her own economic and strategic affiliations with the Moorish empire, which "would have been imperilled

by the loss or impairment of Moroccan independence" (p. 35). He succeeds in giving a convincing and a fair-minded picture of the tangled accumulation of grievances against Morocco, or on the part of Morocco, in which no nation was blameless. The events leading up to the treaty of 1856 with Great Britain and culminating in the Spanish war of 1859-1860 form a dramatic sequence which is of absorbing interest to the student of Moroccan history and of great importance in the study of British diplomacy. Restraint in citing secondary sources and a thorough study of documentary material and diplomatic correspondence give this work an increased value. An index and a selected bibliography are included. W. O. FARNSWORTH.

Guide to the Reports of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, 1870-1911. Part II, *Index of Persons.* Section 1, *A-Lever.* (London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1935, pp. xxiii, 448, 12*s.* 6*d.*) Part I of the *Guide* to the reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, which was published in 1914, was confined to topographical entries. Most of the material for an index of persons had been collected, but the work of editing it was suspended on account of the War and could not be resumed for several years thereafter. The present volume is the first section of Part II of the *Guide;* publication of the second section has been promised during the present year. Though Part II indexes only names—not subjects—it will be of great assistance in the use of the Reports. It is more than a mere index to the separate volume indexes. A notable feature of it is the identification of the individual bearers of historic titles, such as Earl of Argyll.

Canadian Government Documents: a Manual for Librarians. By MARION VILLIERS HIGGINS. (Chicago, American Library Association, 1935, pp. ix, 582, $2.25, planographed.) The use of government documents presents numerous difficulties due to the complexities of government organizations and their methods of publication. As a result bibliographical guides in this field are of the utmost importance. Canadian documents have in the past been poorly supplied with such guides, and Miss Higgins has therefore rendered a signal service to research workers in compiling this handbook, which attempts to list all official documents issued by the central government of Canada from the beginning of the French regime to the present time. Realizing that an intelligent use of documents requires some knowledge of the government which issues them, she has prefaced her lists of publications of each department of the government with a discussion of its history, functions, and organization. In the appended lists of the publications themselves bibliographical entries are brief, although on the whole they are of sufficient length to give the essential facts. In some cases, however, the brevity is to be regretted, especially in various notes of reprints where exact references to original publication are much to be desired. Nevertheless, such occasional insufficiencies do not seriously detract from the value of Miss Higgins's contribution. As a pioneer in the bibliography of Canadian official publications she has laid a foundation for which all those who have occasion to use these documents must be grateful. DORIS M. REED.

Acadia at the End of the Seventeenth Century: Letters, Journals, and Memoirs of Joseph Robineau de Villebon, Commandant in Acadia, 1690-1700, and Other Contemporary Documents. By JOHN CLARENCE WEBSTER. (Saint John, New Brunswick Museum, 1934, pp. xi, 228.) This is the first monographic publication of the remarkable regional museum recently opened by the province of New Brunswick at St. John. Dr. J. C. Webster, who has generously deposited much of his own manuscript and pictorial collections in the museum, here

edits in translation a number of journals, letters, and memoirs of Joseph Robineau de Villebon owned by him, along with certain relevant unpublished materials from Ottawa, Paris, and Boston. He himself contributes a short general introduction and a number of short biographies, as well as notes on population, places, shipping, and the known source materials. Unfortunately he does not state the provenance and character of his individual documents. The collection as a whole provides a lively, revealing picture of Acadia between 1690 and 1700. The merchants, fishermen, and freebooters of New York and New England were reaching out for the economic exploitation of a region which could neither be effectively supported by New France nor in its turn effectively support Newfoundland. At the time the St. John River fur trade was the great prize, for techniques did not yet allow the New Englanders to dominate the Acadian fisheries. Men like Jacob Leisler, John and William Alden, John Nelson, and Edward Tyng were seeking profit in the coils of formal and informal wars, and of Indian alliances, frontier raids, contraband, and public or private neutralities. The apparent confusion can best be resolved by the recollection that these were the years immediately preceding Samuel Vetch's fusion of New York and New England expansionism into the attacks of 1710 and 1711 on Acadia and Canada. Aside from the convincing detail of men and events, perhaps the most useful materials are Villebon's descriptions of Acadia and the Acadians in 1699 (pp. 120-140). J. B. Brebner.

Lord Robert Cecil's Gold Fields Diary. With an Introduction and Notes by Ernest Scott. (Melbourne, University Press; London, Humphrey Milford, 1935, pp. 44, 4*s*. 6*d*.) In the course of a long sea voyage undertaken for his health Lord Robert Cecil visited the gold fields of Victoria in 1852, the year after the great Australian gold rush had begun. He recorded his impressions in a diary, which was found by his daughter, Lady Gwendolen Cecil, among his papers at Hatfield, when she was collecting materials for her biography of her father. The young aristocrat was especially impressed by the law-abiding conduct of the gold diggers at Bendigo, where her Majesty's commissioner, he wrote, "rules a body of 100,000 men; exacts their licence fees, punishes their offences, and guards their gold". He was gratified to find that "the feebleness and meanness" of the official establishment at Bendigo did not weaken respect for constituted authority, and he did not fail to draw a conclusion favorable to monarchical as contrasted with democratic institutions. In a letter written a few weeks later to a friend in England he said: "The most interesting point of view in which the diggings appeared was the marked contrast they presented to California. The rush of population was nearly if not quite as great; the temptations to come were as powerful; the country in which the gold lay was as wild and desolate; but the government was of the Queen, not of the mob; from above, not from below, holding from a supposed right (whether real or not, no matter) and not from 'the people, the source of all legitimate power,' and therefore instead of murders, rapes and robberies daily, Lynch law and a Committee of Vigilance, there was less crime than in a large English town, and more order and civility than I have myself witnessed in my own native village of Hatfield."

ARTICLES

G. N. Clark. Early Capitalism and Invention. *Ec. Hist. Rev.*, Apr.

Conyers Read. Profits on the Recoinage of 1560-1. *Ibid.*

Leo Hicks. The Catholic Exiles and the Elizabethan Religious Settlement. *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, July.

WHITWELL M. DODD. Elizabethan Middle-Class Culture. *Quar. Rev.*, Apr.

MICHAEL LEWIS. The Guns of the *Jesus of Lubeck*. *Mariner's Mirror*, July.

G. F. JAMES and J. J. SUTHERLAND SHAW. Admiralty Administration and Personnel, 1619-1714. *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research*, June.

MELVIN F. TALBOT. Samuel Pepys, Naval Administrator. *Nineteenth Cent. and After*, May.

CHARLES F. MULLETT. The Legal Position of English Protestant Dissenters, 1660-1689. *Virginia Law Rev.*, Mar.

R. R. WALCOTT. Division-Lists of the House of Commons, 1689-1715. *Bull. Inst. Hist. Research*, June.

G. E. FUSSELL. English Agriculture from Arthur Young to William Cobbett. *Ec. Hist. Rev.*, Apr.

JOHN R. FLETCHER. Early Catholic Periodicals in England. *Dublin Rev.*, Apr.

RALPH E. STEDMAN. Bishop Butler and His "Analogy of Religion". *Nineteenth Cent. and After*, May.

F. D. MACKINNON. Origins of Commercial Law. *Law Quar. Rev.*, Jan.

W. S. HOLDSWORTH. Gibbon, Blackstone, and Bentham. *Ibid.*

NORMAN E. HIMES. Jeremy Bentham and the Genesis of English Neo-Malthusianism. *Ec. Hist.*, Feb.

J. H. HEXTER. The Protestant Revival and the Catholic Question in England, 1778-1829. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Sept.

A. S. TURBERVILLE. The House of Lords as a Court of Law, 1784-1837. *Law Quar. Rev.*, Apr.

RAY ST. GEORGE STUBBS. Lord Erskine. *Can. Bar Rev.*, Jan.

M. DOROTHY GEORGE. The Combination Laws. *Ec. Hist. Rev.*, Apr.

MICHAEL ROBERTS. The Ministerial Crisis of May-June, 1812. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, June.

GLADYS BRYSON. Early English Positivists and the Religion of Humanity. *Am. Sociolog. Rev.*, June.

LILLIAN M. PENSON. The Principles and Methods of Lord Salisbury's Foreign Policy. *Cambridge Hist. Jour.*, 1935, no. 1.

KINGSLEY MARTIN. The Evolution of Popular Monarchy. *Pol. Quar.*, Apr.

VICTOR WALLACE GERMAINS. Kitchener at the War Office. *Contemp. Rev.*, June.

HAROLD J. LASKI. The General Election, 1935. *Pol. Quar.*, Jan.

E. S. DE BEER. Sir Charles Firth, 1857-1936. *History*, June.

FRANK J. MANHEIM. The British Colonial System. *Rev. Univ. Ottawa*, Apr.

S. A. SAUNDERS. The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854: A Regional Study. *Can. Jour. Ec. and Pol. Sci.*, Feb.

The Withdrawal of the Imperial Garrison from Newfoundland, 1870. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, June.

A. F. HATTERSLEY. The Annexation of the Transvaal, 1877. *History*, June.

FRANCIS EDWIN HYDE. British Capital and American Enterprise in the North-West. *Ec. Hist. Rev.*, Apr.

H. A. INNIS. Unused Capacity as a Factor in Canadian Economic History. *Can. Jour. Ec. and Pol. Sci.*, Feb.

W. P. M. KENNEDY. The Workings of the British North America Acts, 1867-1931. *Jurid. Rev.*, Mar.

VINCENT C. MACDONALD. Judicial Interpretation of the Canadian Constitution. *Univ. Toronto Law Jour.*, Lent Term.

HANSI P. POLLAK. European Population Growth since Union. *South African Jour. Ec.*, Mar.

ANGUS PARSONS and A. L. CAMPBELL. The South Australian Centenary of Legislation. *Jour. Comp. Legis. and Internat. Law*, Feb.

AUGUSTUS WOLSKEL. Pre-Federation Hopes and Promises. *Victorian Hist. Mag.*, May.

DOCUMENTS

JAMES P. R. LYELL, ed. A Tract on James VI's Succession to the English Throne. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Apr.

D. C. HARVEY, ed. Uniacke's Memorandum to Windham, 1806. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, Mar.

FRANCE, BELGIUM, THE NETHERLANDS

H. E. Bourne

Over Klopjes en Kwezels. By EUGENIE THEISSING. (Utrecht, Dekker and Van de Vegt, 1935, pp. viii, 241, 3.50 fl.) This attractive and useful book is devoted to the history of Roman Catholic sisters who were neither nuns nor Beguines nor Sisters of the Common Life. In the Netherlands north of the Rhine they were commonly called *klopjes,* which is a word of obscure derivation, and south of the Rhine they were termed *kwezels.* The first mention of the former term is in the year 1511. Roman Catholic writers referred to the sisters as *virgines continentes* or *filiae devotae.* The sisters were not considered as members of the clergy, because they never adopted monastic rules, being content with only one of the three monastic vows, namely that of chastity. Sometimes they lived together in a common home, either in very small or fairly large numbers (up to three hundred), and frequently they remained at home, living with parents or a brother or a sister. During the seventeenth century they were a source of concern to the government of the Dutch Republic, since many Protestant preachers continually complained about their activities, especially as teachers. It was very difficult to tell how they should be treated, but they were molested and persecuted from time to time. Nevertheless they were to be found in every large town in the Dutch Republic. Their total number did not, however, exceed 10,000 at any time. During the nineteenth century their institution gradually died out, and now there are very few of them left. Dr. Theissing has done an admirable piece of research. The bibliography is exceptionally good, and the annotations are excellent. The index and the illustrations add to the value of the book. A. HYMA.

Bibliographie critique des principaux travaux parus sur l'histoire de 1600 à 1914: Travaux de la langue française ou relatifs à l'histoire de France. By the SOCIÉTÉ D'HISTOIRE MODERNE. Volume for 1934. (Paris, Maison du Livre Français, 1936, pp. xvi, 192, 30 fr.) The directors of the *Revue d'histoire moderne* are in charge of the enterprise.

The Fronde. By PAUL RICE DOOLIN. [Harvard Historical Studies.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1935, pp. xiii, 181, $3.00.) In the introduction to this essay Professor Doolin asserts that the French government of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was a "limited" rather than an absolute monarchy. He bases this hypothesis on the ground that every example of opposition to the government he has studied "is justified by law". Of these oppositions, in the opinion of the author, the Fronde was the most important. It was a movement which "rested upon a constitutional theory according to which the will of the king is not law". Therefore it was an attempt on the part of such groups as the Parlement of Paris and certain noblemen to restore the "ancient constitution of the state". Professor Doolin not only defends this thesis but also attacks the views of other "authorities". He rejects the description by Lavisse of the Fronde as a game and maintains that any attempt to identify "the Fronde with the Revolution is unhistorical". He does not mention, however, Louis Madelin's interpretation of the Fronde as a "monstrous intrigue" (*La Fronde: Une révolution manquée,* Paris, 1931). In the last four chapters he discusses the official declarations of the government and its opponents and presents a clear analysis of the works written in defense of the various parties involved in the Fronde. The author's conclusions seem to be based upon an intelligent and

thorough study of this subject, and he presents a sound justification of his point of view. An excellent bibliography indicates that he has consulted most of the available material. In short, the volume is a scholarly contribution, not intended for the general reader but for the specialist. FRANKLIN C. PALM.

Catalogue de l'histoire de la Révolution française. Volume I, *Écrits de la période révolutionnaire, 1789-1799* [Abassal-Debry]. Edited by ANDRÉ MARTIN and GÉRARD WALTER. (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, 1936, pp. xiv, 596, 120 fr.) This volume, the first of five, includes 9497 items. There is a preface by Jules Cain, director of the library. The catalogue will have three sections, one including strictly contemporary writings, the second periodicals, with exact nomenclature and other pertinent facts, and the third works published in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Recueil des actes du Comité de salut public. Volume XXVII. Edited by F. A. AULARD and PAUL MAUTOUCHET. (Paris, E. Leroux, 1936, pp. 720, 95 fr.) The appearance of this volume after a lapse of thirteen years from the date of publication of Volume XXVI is accounted for first by decreasing appropriations, then by the death of Professor Aulard, and finally by the fact that when, in 1933, the work on the new volume was completed by the present editor, Mautouchet, the first seven signatures, printed before Aulard's death, were nowhere to be found, probably mislaid when the Imprimerie nationale was moved to new quarters. Fortunately the forms had been kept, otherwise the delay would have been still greater.

L'Égypte de 1828 à 1830: Correspondance des consuls de France en Égypte. Edited by GEORGES DOUIN. (Paris, E. Leroux, 1936, pp. 524, 60 fr.) This new volume of documents on early phases of the Egyptian question from the French point of view is one of the publications of the Société royale de géographie d'Égypte.

ARTICLES

ANDRÉ GIRODIE et E. DE LÉVIS MIREPOIX. Pèlerinages historiques des voyageurs américains en France. *Franco-Am. Rev.*, June.

JEAN JALLA. Le refuge dans les vallées vaudoises: Les relations entre la France protestante et le Piémont pendant le règne d'Emmanuel-Philibert, 1559-1580 [concl'd]. *Bull. Soc. Hist. Prot. Fr.*, Jan.

JEAN NIEDERMEIER. Aperçu de l'histoire des Juifs de Metz dans la première période française. *Rev. Ques. Hist.*, May.

ÉTIENNE DE CHABANNES-LA PALISSE. Camp de Boulogne, 1745. *Ibid.*, May and July.

G. HUBRECHT. La région sedanaise à la veille de la Révolution: Les campagnes et leurs habitants. *An. Hist. Rév. Fr.*, July.

ALBERT MEYNIER. La terre et la paysan de la Révolution à l'Empire, 1789-1815 [I]. *Rév. Fr., Rev. Hist. Cont.*, 1936, no. 2.

ANDRÉE GOBERT. Le district des Enfants Trouvés au Faubourg Saint-Antoine en 1789 [I]. *Ibid.*

G. AUBERT. La révolution à Douai [III]. *An. Hist. Rév. Fr.*, May.

O. J. FREDERIKSEN. The Bureaus of the French Constituent Assembly of 1789: an Early Experiment in the Group Conference Method. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, Sept.

CARL HAMILTON PEGG. Sentiments républicains dans la presse parisienne à partir du retour de Louis XVI, jusqu'au report des sept comités. *An. Hist. Rév. Fr.*, July.

M. EUDE. La politique sociale de la Commune robespierriste, le neuf thermidor. *Ibid.*

M. BOULOISEAU. Les comités de surveillance des arrondissments de Paris à la fin de l'an III [III]. *Ibid.*, May.

ALBERTO LUMBROSO. Uno sconosciuto amore giovanile di Napoleone. *N. Antol.*, July 1.

HENRI DE MONTARDY. À propos de Talleyrand. *Rev. Études Hist.*, June.

HERMANN WENDEL. Henri Heine et la Révolution française. *Rév. Fr., Rev. Hist. Cont.*, 1936, no. 2.

ANDRÉ LACROIX. Un philosophe conseiller d'État sous la Restauration: Maine de Biran. *Rev. Pol. et Parl.*, July 10.

E. TARLÉ. La grande coalition des mineurs de Rive-de-Gier en 1844. *Rev. Hist.*, Mar.

A. DUPRONT. Jules Ferry opposant à l'Empire: Quelques traits de son idéologie républicaine. *Ibid.*

ROBERT SCHNERB. Napoleon III and the Second French Empire [bibliographical article]. *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Sept.

HELMUTH GREINER. Die französische Mobilmachung, 1914. *Berl. Monatsh.*, July.

DOCUMENTS

PIERO MISCIATTELLI, ed. Niccolò Tommaseo: Pagine inedite intorno alle cose di Francia. *N. Antol.*, Feb. 1.

PAUL ROUSSIER. Lettres du général Leclerc adressées au Premier Consul et au Ministre de la Marine au cours de l'expédition de Saint-Domingue, 1802. *Rev. Hist. Col.*, 1936, no. 2.

CONSTANTIN DE GRUNWALD, ed. Les débuts diplomatiques de Metternich à Paris [from unpublished parts of Metternich's memoirs]. *Rev. Paris*, Aug. 1.

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, HUNGARY, SWITZERLAND

E. N. Anderson

Leopold von Ranke: Gedächtnisrede. By FRIEDRICH MEINECKE. [Sonderausgabe aus den Sitzungsberichten der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Festvortrag in der öffentlichen Sitzung vom 23. Januar 1936.] (Berlin, 1936.) This essay is the ripe fruit of many years of study of the problem of historical interpretation. Although it adds little that is new to the author's other writings on the subject, it should be read. It reveals the intimate kinship of Meinecke's and Ranke's thinking more clearly than ever before and is a beautifully written, compact summary of their ideas.

Übersicht über die Bestände des brandenburg-preussischen Hausarchivs zu Berlin-Charlottenburg. By L. DEHIO, E. HÖLK, and K. JAGOW. [Mitteilungen der preussischen Archivverwaltung.] (Leipzig, 1936, pp. 87.) This small volume continues the series of publications concerning the materials to be found in the Prussian archives. It covers the archive which before the changes ensuing on 1918 was called the "Royal House Archive". The presence of Dr. Dehio's name alone would suffice to guarantee its thoroughness and accuracy. The editors preface the volume with a short history of the archive and a compact explanation of the system of ordering the materials to be found in it. They credit King Frederick William IV and Emperor Frederick III with having done most for the archive and state that these two rulers left their entire *Nachlass* to it. To mention the most important of the bodies of material listed in this book would be superfluous. It should be pointed out that the archive contains the papers of many officials closely connected with the royal family—men like Hinzpeter, August von der Heydt, Max Duncker, Edwin von Manteuffel. Anyone working in the history of the Hohenzollerns or of Prussia will find this little guide highly useful; but he must not forget that the division of materials between this archive and the state archive in Berlin-Dahlem has often been arbitrary, that the location of private collections has been even more arbitrary, and that the list of private collections found here is incomplete.

ARTICLES

M. J. Elsas. Price Data from Munich, 1500-1700. *Ec. Hist.*, Feb.

Helmut Minkowski. Die Neu-Atlantis des Francis Bacon und die Leopoldino-Carolina: Zur Vorgeschichte der ersten deutschen Naturwissenschaftlichen Gelehrten Gesellschaft. *Arch. f. Kulturgesch.*, 1936, no. 3.

Becker. Zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte der sudwestdeutschen Grenzmark 1760-1848. *Ibid.*

Jean de Boislisle. L'équipée à Strasbourg de Frédéric le Grand. *Rev. Hist. Dipl.*, Apr.

Gerhard Köster-Arnswalde. Die Entwicklung der norddeutschen Verkehrsstrassen bis 1800. *Forsch. Brandenburg. und Preuss. Gesch.*, Feb.

D. Fritz Dönhoff. Wilhelm Krüger und die deutsche Kriegswirtschaft 1806-1813. *Ibid.*

Otto Tschirch. Friedrich Buchholz, Friedrich von Coelln und Julius von Voss, drei preussische Publizisten in der Zeit der Fremdherrschaft 1806-1812. *Ibid.*

Alexander Scharff. General Carl Graf von der Groeben und die deutsche Politik König Friedrich Wilhelms IV. *Ibid.*

Carl Boysen. Der Kronprinz und Schleswig-Holstein. *Ibid.*

K. Haenchen. Flucht und Rückkehr des Prinzen von Preussen im Jahre 1848. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, 1936, no. 1.

Hans Harras. Die wirtschaftliche Auffassung von Theodor Bernhardis. *Schmollers Jahrb.*, Apr.

Hans Hallmann. Bismarck und Marokko. *Ibid.*

Ernst Kabisch. Mobilmachung und Aufmarsch Belgiens 1914. *Berl. Monatsh.*, June.

Theobald von Schäfer. Die deutsche Mobilmachung von 1914. *Ibid.*, Aug.

Albrecht Gerhard. Soziale Probleme und Sozialpolitik in Deutschland während des Weltkrieges. *Jahrb. f. Nationalökon. und Statis.*, July.

Oskar Vasella. Der Krieg Berns gegen Savoyen im Jahre 1536 und die Unterwerfung der savoyischen Territorien durch Bern nach den amtlichen Aufzeichnungen der bernischen Kanzlei. *Zeitsch. f. Schweiz. Kirchengesch.*, 1936, no. 1.

DOCUMENTS

Thomas A. Bailey. German Documents Relating to the "Lusitania". *Jour. Mod. Hist.*, Sept.

Italy

Gaudens Megaro

F[rancesco] Ruffini. *Metodisti e sociniani nella Ginevra della restaurazione.* (Florence, Civiltà Moderna, 1936, pp. 57.) The Italian historian, Adolfo Omodeo, has done well to edit this learned monograph by the distinguished Italian canonist and historical scholar, the late Senator Ruffini.

ARTICLES

Antonio Corsano. Il Pomponazzi e la riforma religiosa. *N. Riv. Stor.*, Jan.

Delio Cantimori. Recenti studi intorno alla Riforma in Italia e ai riformatori italiani all' estero, 1924-1934. *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, Mar.

Pietro Savio. Per l'epistolario di Paolo Sarpi. *Aevum*, Jan.

Gioacchino Volpe. Principî di risorgimento nel settecento italiano. *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, Mar.

Ephraim E. Urbach. Aus der Geschichte der Juden in Italien im 18. Jahrhundert. *Monatssch. f. Gesch. und Wiss. des Judentums*, May.

Max Braubach. Prinz Eugen von Savoyen. *Hist. Zeitsch.*, 1936, no. 1.

Ersilio Michel. Pasquale Paoli a Livorno, 1795. *Arch. Stor. Corsica*, Apr.

Marie-Louise Blumer. Le transport en France des objets d'art cédés par le traité de Tolentino. *Rev. Études Ital.*, Jan.

Ferdinand Boyer. Les Benso de Cavour et Napoléon. *Ibid.*

L'attentato Rivarola e i processi politici del 1828. *Civiltà Cattolica*, Mar. 21, Apr. 18, May 16, July 4.

Alessandro Levi. Il centenario della morte di G. D. Romagnosi (Bilancio bibliografico). *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 1936, no. 1.

A. Messineo. Gian Domenico Romagnosi e il P. Luigi Taparelli D'Azeglio. *Civiltà Cattolica*, Jan. 4.

Emilio Goggio. First Personal Contact between American and Italian Leaders of Thought. *Romanic Rev.*, Jan.

Antonio Monti. La politica di Carlo Alberto e le sue "Réflexions Historiques". *R. Ist. Lombardo Sci. e Lett., Rendiconti.* 1936, nos. 1-5.

Id. Adolescenza e giovinezza del Re Galantuomo: Da nuovi documenti. *N. Antol.*, Jan. 1, 16.

B. C[roce]. Intorno alla "Storia d'Italia" di Don Bosco. *Critica*, Mar. 20.

Del "cattivo gusto", ossia: Benedetto Croce, la "Storia d'Italia" di D. Bosco, l'"Indice". *Civiltà Cattolica*, Apr. 18.

Franco Valsecchi. I problemi europei nella politica del 1859. *Riv. Stor. Ital.*, Mar.

A. J. P. Taylor. European Mediation and the Agreement of Villafranca, 1859. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Jan.

Franco Valsecchi. La politica di Cavour e la Prussia nel 1859. *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 1936, no. 1.

L'Inghilterra contro la guerra del Cinquantanove. *N. Antol.*, Apr. 1.

L'avversario di Cavour nel 1859: Lord Malmesbury. *Ibid.*, Mar. 16.

Giacomo Medici Del Vascello. Italia e Inghilterra: Ieri e oggi. *Ibid.*, Jan. 1.

Mildred Mansfield. England and Italy. *Dublin Rev.*, Jan.

Fernand Hayward and André Clot. La Marine italienne de Garibaldi à Mussolini. *Rev. Hebd.*, Feb. 15.

Ruggero Moscati. Riordinamenti nel R. Archivio di Stato di Napoli: Le carte del Gabinetto di Questura, 1861-1882. *Archivi*, 1936, no. 1.

La Question romaine. *Mercure de Fr.*, May 1.

Romeo Gallenga. Ricordi del primo movimento per la Conciliazione. *N. Antol.*, Feb. 1.

Pier Ludovico Occhini. Enrico Corradini africanista. *Ibid.*, Jan. 16.

Augusto Torre. Origini dell' Accordo Tripartito per l'Abissinia. *Ibid.*, Feb. 16.

Silvio Negro. Benedetto XV o "Della puntualità". *Ibid.*, Jan. 16.

DOCUMENTS

Tommaso Sorbelli, ed. Documenti sulle relazioni tra il Vico e il Muratori. *Gior. Stor. Lett. Ital.*, Dec.

Raffaele Ciampini, ed. Il diario inedito del Tommaseo. *Convivium*, Mar.

Alessandro Guiccioli. Diario del 1880. *N. Antol.*, June 1, 16.

Albano Sorbelli, ed. Margherita di Savoia, regina d'Italia, "A scuola di latino": Lettere inedite a Marco Minghetti. *Ibid.*, May 1.

Northern Europe

L. M. Larson

Hansisch- norwegische Handelspolitik im 16. Jahrhundert. By Otto Röhlk. [Abhandlungen zur Handels- und Seegeschichte im Auftrage des hansischen Geschichtsvereins.] (Neumünster, Karl Wachholz, 1935, pp. viii, 92, 4.80 M.) This study deals with various aspects of the Hanseatic-Norwegian trade in the sixteenth century: the economic basis of the trade, its organization, Norwegian commercial policy, the competition of Dutch and other traders, and the effect of large economic changes. The author sees in the difference in the change in the prices of import and export goods at Bergen an explanation of the strength of the Hanseatic merchants in Norway's trade at the time; from 1530 to 1600 the price of grain in terms of fish had doubled in Bergen. This difference prevented the accumulation of capital in Bergen and made its trade dependent on the Hanseatic merchants. From this dependence the Norwegians were to

be freed by the competition of the Dutch in the next century. This work has been drawn largely from Norwegian and German studies, though the author has also used original sources in Bergen, Lübeck, and Rostock. It is to be recommended as a useful survey of the Hanseatic-Norwegian trade. The appendix contains statistical information on the ships of Bergen and Hanseatic cities in the Bergen trade at various dates. HENRIETTA M. LARSON.

Sweden: the Middle Way. By MARQUIS W. CHILDS. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1936, pp. xvi, 171, $2.50.) This is a study in the history and present status of the co-operative movement in Sweden. The author finds that "to-day approximately one-third of all retail trade and more than 10 percent of wholesale trade and manufacture for domestic consumption are carried on by co-operatives without profit". Since the movement had its roots in agricultural conditions, especially in Denmark, Mr. Childs has included a chapter on the organization of agriculture in that country. The author also discusses several subjects closely related to co-operation in trade, such as low cost housing, a national power system, and "liquor control that works". He has also something to say about the state in industry and of the methods used to lift the nation out of the "depression", all of which makes interesting reading in the year 1936.

ARTICLES

HARALD TVETERÅS. Norges historie: Bibliografi, 1933. *Hist. Tidsskr.*, 1936, no. 2.

HERMAN BRULIN. Schwedens Archiv- und Bibliothekswesen. *Nord. Rundschau*, 1935, no. 2.

FREDRIK LAGERROTH. Revolution eller rättskontinuitet. *Scandia*, 1936, no. 1.

JOHANNES SCHIÖTZ. Norges militäre problem, 1709-1710. *Hist. Tidsskr.*, 1936, no. 2.

JOHAN SCHREINER. Harald og Havsfjord. *Scandia*, 1936, no. 1.

ADOLF SCHÜCK. Hur en östersjöstat föddes [Latvia]. *Nord. Tidskr.*, 1936, no. 4.

RUSSIA AND POLAND

Avrahm Yarmolinsky

The Private Letters of Baron de Vioménil on Polish Affairs, with a Letter on the Siege of Yorktown. Translation and Notes by JOHN FRANCIS GOUGH. (Jersey City, Collins Doan Company, 1935, pp. xv, 275, $5.00.) This book is a translation of a French work published in 1807, the purpose of which was to furnish material for the completion of the unfinished "Histoire de l'anarchie de Pologne" by the French academician Claude Carloman de Rulhière. It includes the following documents: (1) Twelve letters from Baron Vioménil, French officer, agent, and representative of the French government to the Polish Confederacy in 1771 and 1772. The letters were written between December 31, 1771, and April 29, 1772, and deal almost entirely with the seizure and defense of the Citadel of Cracow by the French and Poles. (2) Text of the Treaty of Partition of 1772. (3) Reminiscences of a count who was a Frenchman in personal contact with Prince Henry of Prussia, from whom he obtained the account here given of the negotiations of the partitioning powers. This is a book of very slight importance. Much of the material is interesting, but the important facts presented are no longer new—as they were in 1807. While the minor episodes recounted here (as for example the taking of the Citadel of Cracow) make rather stirring reading, they are without significance in the history of Poland.

JULIA S. ORVIS.

The Testimony of Kolchak and Other Siberian Materials. Edited by ELENA VARNECK and H. H. FISHER. Translated by Elena Varneck. [Hoover War Library

Publications.] (Stanford University, University Press, 1935, pp. xi, 466, $5.00.) The major part of the volume under review is occupied by a translation of Kolchak's testimony, first published in full from a stenographic record in Leningrad, in 1925. It represents a valuable contribution to the source material of Russian history. The remainder, composed of badly written memoirs of a certain Red partisan by the name of Ovchinnikov and of a compilation from various sources describing the Nikolaevsk massacre and the seizure of Vladivostok by the Japanese in April, 1920, has much less historical value, notwithstanding the opinion of the editors to the contrary. One must confess that, considering the means at the disposal of the editors, the result of their work is bad. First of all, the translation by Elena Varneck is appalling. Thus she translates the Russian term *agent* literally as agent, although it really means attaché (p. 21). In another instance she translates in the same paragraph the Russian word *minonosets* both as destroyer and as torpedo boat (p. 72), although there is a considerable difference between these two naval terms. One feels that the translator is not only unfamiliar with naval terms but also with the usage of the English language. As for the editing, one is surprised to find such gems as "old Lieutenant Veselago" (p. 72), whereas it should have been "Lieutenant-Commander Veselago". It is true that the Russian text says *starago* (a misprint) instead of *starshago,* but the editors announce that they had asked the advice of four Russian naval officers. They might have included Veselago, who has been living in this country for the last ten years. The value of the volume is saved by a comprehensive index and an excellent bibliography.

LEONID I. STRAKHOVSKY.

ARTICLES

ALEXANDER MILLER. Feudalism in England and Russia. *Slavonic Rev.*, Apr.

S. I. ARKHANGEL'SKI. Anglo-gollandskaya torgovlya s Moskvoy v XVII v. [English-Dutch commerce with Moscow in the seventeenth century]. *Istoricheski sbornik*, 1936, no. 5.

P. G. LYUBOMIROV. Nachal'nyye momenty v istorii khlopchato-bumazhnoi promyshlennosti v Rossii [early history of the cotton industry in the seventeenth century]. *Ibid.*

S. V. DRANITZYN. K voprosu ob ekonomicheskikh kornyakh vosstaniya v 1863 g. v Pol'she [economic roots of the rebellion of 1863 in Poland]. *Ibid.*

S. OKUN'. Vozniknoveniye Rossiisko-Amerikanskoi kompanii [origin of the Russian-American Company]. *Ibid.*

K. V. BAZILEVICH. K voprosu ob izucheniy tamozhennykh knig 17 v. [customhouse records of the seventeenth century]. *Problemy istochnikovedeniya*, 1936, no. 2.

S. N. BYKOVSKI. Mnimaya "izmena" Bolotnikova [Bolotnikov's imaginary "treason"]. *Ibid.*

YE. ZVYAGINTZEV. Ognennoye zapaleniye Moskvy [burning of Moscow, 1748] *Bor'ba klassov*, Feb.

D. KASHINTZEV. Gornozavodskaya promyshlennost' Urala i krest'yanskaya voina 1773–74 gg. [the mining industry of the Urals and the Peasant War, 1773–1774]. *Istorik-marksist*, 1936, no. 1.

S. TOMSINSKII. Znacheniye reform Petra I [the significance of the reforms of Peter I]. *Ibid.*, no. 2.

MAURICE W. BRUCE. The Jacobites and Peter the Great. *Slavonic Rev.*, Jan.

PHILIP E. MOSELY. Russian Policy in Asia, 1838-9. *Ibid.*, Apr.

THOMAS K. FORD. The Genesis of the First Hague Peace Conference. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, Sept.

NICHOLAS GOLOVIN. The Russian War Plan of 1914. *Slavonic Rev.*, Apr., July.

D. FEDOTOFF WHITE. Soviet Philosophy of War. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, Sept.

DOCUMENTS

P. GORIN, ed. Iz istorii osvoyeniya Severnovo morskovo puti: Ekspeditziya Beringa 1732–1743 gg. "Doneseniye Beringa s yevo prilozheniyami" [Bering's expedition, 1732–1743,

exploration of the Northern Sea route: Bering's Report with supplements]. *Krasnyi arkhiv*, 1935, nos. 71-74.

S. Okun, ed. K istorii Buryatii v 17 v. [Buryatia in the seventeenth century]. *Ibid.*, 1936, no. 3.

M. Krutikov, ed. Pervyye zheleznyye dorogi v Rossii [first railroads in Russia]. *Ibid.*

S. P., ed. K istorii Parizhskovo mira 1856 g. [Peace of Paris, 1856]. *Ibid.*, no. 2.

R. Martel. Nouveaux documents d'histoire russe. *Monde Slave*, 1936, no. 1.

THE FAR EAST

C. H. Peake

A History of the Far East. By G. Nye Steiger. (Boston, Ginn and Company, 1936, pp. vii, 928, $4.75.) Professor Steiger is well qualified to write a general book on Eastern Asia not only because of his established reputation as a scholar but also because of long residence in China. This most recent work is an ambitious one which surveys China, India, Central Asia, Indo-China, Malaysia, Korea, and Japan from earliest times through 1932. Every chapter, from the Mongols to the section dealing with the United States as a power in Eastern Asia, shows the author's familiarity with the complexities of things political. There is no serious criticism of this book insofar as grasp of material is concerned. The chief objection lies in a presentation which leads to confusion. Chapter II deals with China, chapter III with India, chapter IV with Central Asia generally. Then, in chapters V and VI, China is again taken up, followed in succeeding chapters by India and Central Asia, Indo-China, Malaysia, and Korea. Consequently, the reader uninitiated in the details of Eastern Asiatic history finds himself lost by roaming all the way from the Ch'in dynasty of China to a survey of the Maurya dynasty of India, to be further bewildered by treks into Central Asia and then back to the Chinese of the Hans and the Indians of the Delhi Sultanate. Furthermore, when this labyrinth has been entered, there are side paths leading to Tatars, Turks, Ouigours, and Tibetans, with the result that the reader is discouraged before he has read two hundred pages. In spite of its defects, however, this book ranks potentially with the best American texts in the field—Latourette's, Williams's, Treat's, and Morse and MacNair's. It is to be hoped that in a revised edition the author will achieve a greater degree of concentration in his narrative, and that he will substitute a critical, annotated bibliography for the present conventional readings and references.

Thomas E. Ennis.

ARTICLES

C. P. Fitzgerald. Historical Evidence for the Growth of the Chinese Population [I, II]. *Sociolog. Rev.*, Apr., July.

Émile Gaspardone. Bibliographie Annamite. *Bull. École Fr. Extrême-Orient*, XXXIV, 1934 [received 1936].

Jean Gates. Model Emperors of the Golden Age in Chinese Lore. *Jour. Am. Oriental Soc.*, Mar.

Unokichi Hattori. Confucius' Conviction of his Heavenly Mission. *Harvard Jour. Asiatic Stud.*, Apr.

Derk Bodde. The Attitude toward Science and Scientific Method in Ancient China. *T'ien Hsia Monthly*, Feb.

Ma, Fei-po. Ch'in Han Ching-chi Shih Tzu-liao: Wu, Jen-k'ou chi T'u-ti [materials for the study of the economic history of the Ch'in and the Han dynasties, 256 B.C.–221 A.D.: pt. V, population and land]. *Shih Huo*, Jan.

Shih, Nien-hai. Hsi-Han Hou-kuo K'ao [feudal principalities of the Former Han dynasty, 206 B.C.–25 A.D.]. *Yü Kung*, Jan.

T'AO, YÜAN-CHEN. Liang-Han chih Chi Pei-pu Han-ts'u Nan-ch'ien K'ao [southern migration of the Chinese in the early first century A.D.]. *Ibid.*, Feb.

WU, HSIEN-CH'ING. Pei-Wei Chün-t'ien Chih-tu chih I K'ao-ch'a [the system employed for an equitable redistribution of the land during the Northern Wei dynasty, 398–534 A.D.]. *Shih Huo*, Jan.

HO, TZU-CH'ÜAN. Chung-ku Ta-ts'u Ssu-yüan Ling-hu Yen-chiu [the condition and status of the slaves attached to the monasteries and to wealthy families, *ca.* 221–750]. *Ibid.*

I, MAN-HUI. T'ang-tai ti Jen-k'ou [the population of China during the T'ang dynasty, 618–907]. *Ibid.*, Feb.

WANG, JIH-WEI. T'ang-hou Hui-hu K'ao [the Ouigours since the T'ang dynasty]. *Shih Hsüeh Chi-k'an*, Apr.

WU, HAN. Shih-liu Shih-chi-ch'ien chih Chung-kuo yü Nan-yang [China and the South Pacific Islands prior to the sixteenth century]. *Ch'ing-hua Hsüeh-pao*, Jan.

Id. Yüan Ti-kuo chih Peng-hui yü Ming chih Chien-kuo [the fall of the Mongol Empire and the rise of the Ming dynasty, *ca.* 1368]. *Ibid.*, Apr.

CH'IU, K'AI-MING. The Introduction of Spectacles into China. *Harvard Jour. Asiatic Stud.*, July.

M. ANESAKI. Psychological Observations on the Persecutions of the Catholics in Japan in the Seventeenth Century. *Ibid.*, Apr.

J. J. L. DUYVENDAK. The First Siamese Embassy to Holland. *T'oung Pao*, XXXII, no. 4.

P. PELLIOT. Les relations du Siam et de la Hollande en 1608. *Ibid.*

HENRI BERNARD. Études sur l'humanisme chrétien en Chine à la fin de la dynastie des Ming. *Nankai Soc. and Ec. Quar.*, Apr.

WALTER FUCHS. The Personal Chronicle of the First Manchu Emperor. *Pacific Affairs*, Mar.

JOHN GILBERT REID. Peking's First Manchu Emperor. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, June.

HENRI BERNARD. Les îles Philippines du Grand archipel de la Chine: Un essai de conquête spirituelle de l'Extrême-Orient. *Collectanea Commissionis Synodalis*, Feb.

P. A. LEUPE. The Seige and Capture of Malacca from the Portuguese in 1640–1641. *Jour. Malayan Branch Roy. Asiatic Soc.*, Jan.

LIEN, SHIH-SHENG. Ssu-mi Ya-tan Lun Chung-kuo [Adam Smith on China]. *Shih Huo*, Jan.

WANG, YÜ-CH'ÜAN. The Rise of Land Tax and the Fall of Dynasties in Chinese History. *Pacific Affairs*, June.

WANG, YING. T'ai-p'ing T'ien-kuo Ke-ming Ch'ien-hsi ti T'u-ti Wen-t'i [the agrarian situation on the eve of the T'ai-p'ing rebellion, *ca.* 1850]. *Chung-shan Wen-hua Chiao-yü-kuan Chi-k'an*, Jan.

J. K. FAIRBANK. The Creation of the Foreign Inspectorate of Customs at Shanghai. *Chinese Soc. and Pol. Sci. Rev.*, Jan., Apr.

KNIGHT BIGGERSTAFF. The Establishment of Permanent Chinese Diplomatic Missions Abroad. *Ibid.*, Apr.

T. K. CHUAN. Tseng Kuo-fan. *T'ien Hsia Monthly*, Feb.

EARL CRANSTON. Shanghai in the Taiping Period. *Pacific Hist. Rev.*, June.

G. PADOUX. List of English and French Translations of Modern Chinese Laws and Regulations, 1907–1935. *Chinese Soc. and Pol. Sci. Rev.*, Jan.

TSUI, SHU-CHIN. The Influence of the Canton-Moscow Entente upon Sun Yat-sen's Revolutionary Tactics. *Ibid.*, Apr.

UNITED STATES HISTORY

E. C. Burnett

GENERAL

Colonial Captivities, Marches, and Journeys. By ISABEL M. CALDER. [The National Society of the Colonial Dames of America.] (New York, Macmillan Company, 1935, pp. vii, 255, $2.50.) This welcome volume of source materials relates to eighteenth century colonial North America. The eighteen documents here

presented were selected for publication by Dr. J. F. Jameson of the Library of Congress and have been edited with care by Dr. Calder. These throw interesting light upon military, naval, economic, and social aspects of the period. The first five are concerned with the captivity at Quebec or New Orleans of British subjects by the French. "The Journal of a Captive, 1745-1748" is the longest and the most illuminating of any of the documents included in the volume; it is, therefore, especially to be regretted that the identity of the author has not been established. Then follow seven documents relating to economic servitudes. Although portions of "The Journal of Charlotte Brown", who was matron of the general hospital of the forces under General Braddock, have been edited by Fairfax Harrison and printed in the *Virginia Magazine of History,* the entire journal is here printed. The two relations of François de Montigny, S. J., of the years 1699 and 1700 throw light upon conditions on the lower Mississippi under which missionary activities were carried on among the various Indian tribes. Finally three documents of a later period are presented, written by Englishmen who were in the region to the east of the Mississippi in the years 1766, 1768, and 1771, respectively. One cannot forebear in this connection referring to the testimony of Captain Harry Gordon in 1766 relative to the great floods on the upper Mississippi, which indicates that there would be today a vast problem of flood control in this region had there been no destruction of the timber of the watersheds or disturbance of the soil through erosion.

LAWRENCE H. GIPSON.

ARTICLES

CHARLES A. BEARD. Corporations and Natural Rights. *Virginia Quar. Rev.,* July.

CHARLES S. HYNEMAN. Administrative Adjudication: an Analysis [I]. *Pol. Sci. Quar.,* Sept.

RICHARD PARES. American versus Continental Warfare, 1739-63. *Eng. Hist. Rev.,* July.

MURRAY KANE. Some Considerations of the Safety Valve Doctrine. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.,* Sept.

BAYRD STILL. An Interpretation of the Statehood Process, 1800 to 1850. *Ibid.*

F. GARVIN DAVENPORT. The Essay on *Habeas Corpus* in the Judge Sharkey Papers. *Ibid.*

French Consular Agents in the United States, 1791-1850. *Franco-Am. Rev.,* June.

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN. A Jesuit Westward Movement. *Mid-America,* July.

MARY PAUL FITZGERALD. A Jesuit Circuit Rider [Father Paul Mary Ponziglione]. *Ibid.*

MARY CANISIUS MINAHAN. James A. McMaster: a Pioneer Catholic Journalist. *Rec. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.,* June.

ROBERT C. CLARK. The Diplomatic Mission of Sir John Rose, 1871. *Pacific Northwest Quar.,* July.

JEANNETTE P. NICHOLS. A Painful Lesson in Silver Diplomacy [1887]. *South Atlantic Quar.,* July.

ALPHONSE M. SCHWITALLA. Trends in Professional Education. *Educational Rec.,* July.

IDA L. SMITH. National Group Settlements. *Aerend,* Spring.

JOHN G. VANDEUSEN. The Negro in Politics. *Jour. Negro Hist.,* July.

J. FRED RIPPY. Can the United States maintain Neutrality? *South Atlantic Quar.,* July.

HJALMAR R. HOLLAND. Concerning the Kensington Rune Stone. *Minnesota Hist.,* June.

GEORGE M. STEPHENSON. The John Lind Papers. *Ibid.*

JAMES C. MALIN. Frank Heywood Hodder, 1860-1935. *Kansas Hist. Quar.,* May.

DOCUMENTS

Correspondance Intime de Gérard de Rayneval avec Hennin. *Franco-Am. Rev.,* June.

WALTER H. STOWE, ed. Additional Letters of Reverend Abraham Beach, 1772-1791. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Episcopal Church,* June.

NEW ENGLAND AND MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

Records of the Court of New Castle on Delaware. Volume II, *1681-1699, Land and Probate Abstract Only.* Edited by ALBERT COOK MYERS. (Philadelphia, The

Colonial Society of Pennsylvania, 1935, pp. 254, $10.00.) The original minutes of the court for the period have disappeared. All that survives is a manuscript volume of items respecting land titles, probate proceedings, etc., made by Delaware in 1770. The printing is from this record. The first volume of this publication appeared in 1904.

ARTICLES

CLIFFORD K. SHIPTON. Provincial Literary Leaven. *New Eng. Quar.*, June.

ROBERT R. WALCOTT. Husbandry in New England. *Ibid.*

CHARLES MAMPOTENG. The Reverend Samuel Peters, M. A., Missionary at Hebron, Connecticut, 1760-1774. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Episcopal Church*, June.

ROBERT H. LORD. The Organizer of the Church in New England [Bishop Benedict Joseph Fenwick]. *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, July.

ROBERT L. O'BRIEN. Memoir of John Carroll Chase [1849-1936]. *New Eng. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July.

VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS. Business Records of Brown Brothers & Co., New York, 1825-1880. *Bull. New York Public Library*, June.

Records of Trinity Church Parish, New York City [cont'd]. *New York Geneal. and Biog. Rec.*, July.

ROSALIE F. BAILEY. Dr. Charles McKnight, Original Member of the Society of the Cincinnati, and his Descendants [cont'd]. *Ibid.*

HARROLD E. GILLINGHAM. The First Fire Engines used in America. *New York Hist. Soc. Quar. Bull.*, July.

ARTHUR ADAMS. Richard Hancock and the Settlement of Bridgeton. *Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc.*, July.

MILTON C. WESTPHAL. Early Moravian Pietism. *Pennsylvania Hist.*, July.

AUSTIN E. HUTCHESON. Philadelphia and the Panic of 1857. *Ibid.*

RICHARD H. HEINDEL. Some Letters of Peter Stephen Du Ponceau. *Ibid.*

JUDITH ANDERSON. Anna Dickinson, Anti-Slavery Radical. *Ibid.*

FRANCIS LORETTO CONLIN. The Democratic Party in Pennsylvania from 1856 to 1865. *Rec. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.*, June.

JOSEPH J. MEKEEL. Glimpses into Haverford Quakeriana. *Bull. Friends' Hist. Assoc.*, Spring.

MARIAN SILVEUS. Churches and Social Control on the Western Pennsylvania Frontier. *Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag.*, June.

DOCUMENTS

Letter of the Earl of Hillsborough to Sir Henry Moore, February 25, 1768. *Bull. Fort Ticonderoga Museum*, July.

ROBERT G. JOHNSON, JOSEPH S. SICKLER, eds. Strictures upon Major General Simcoe's Military Journal in the American Revolution. *Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc.*, July.

LELAND D. BALDWIN, ed. Orders issued by General Henry Lee during the Campaign against the Whiskey Insurrectionists. *Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag.*, June.

EDWARD D. SNYDER and ANNA B. HEWITT, eds. Letters of John Greenleaf Whittier [1842-1892]. *Bull. Friends' Hist. Assoc.*, Spring.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The History of the German Friendly Society of Charleston, South Carolina, 1766-1916. Compiled from Original Sources by GEORGE J. GONGAWARE. (Richmond, Garrett and Massie, 1935, pp. xv, 226. $3.00.) It has long been recognized that the German element has made important racial and cultural contributions to the life of Charleston. German immigrants appeared in the city in considerable numbers during the second quarter of the eighteenth century, and this original group has been more or less constantly recruited by fresh arrivals until recent years. There are evidences on all sides of significant achievements by these people in commerce, in civic affairs, in religion, and in music. German is

presented were selected for publication by Dr. J. F. Jameson of the Library of Congress and have been edited with care by Dr. Calder. These throw interesting light upon military, naval, economic, and social aspects of the period. The first five are concerned with the captivity at Quebec or New Orleans of British subjects by the French. "The Journal of a Captive, 1745-1748" is the longest and the most illuminating of any of the documents included in the volume; it is, therefore, especially to be regretted that the identity of the author has not been established. Then follow seven documents relating to economic servitudes. Although portions of "The Journal of Charlotte Brown", who was matron of the general hospital of the forces under General Braddock, have been edited by Fairfax Harrison and printed in the *Virginia Magazine of History*, the entire journal is here printed. The two relations of François de Montigny, S. J., of the years 1699 and 1700 throw light upon conditions on the lower Mississippi under which missionary activities were carried on among the various Indian tribes. Finally three documents of a later period are presented, written by Englishmen who were in the region to the east of the Mississippi in the years 1766, 1768, and 1771, respectively. One cannot forebear in this connection referring to the testimony of Captain Harry Gordon in 1766 relative to the great floods on the upper Mississippi, which indicates that there would be today a vast problem of flood control in this region had there been no destruction of the timber of the watersheds or disturbance of the soil through erosion.

LAWRENCE H. GIPSON.

ARTICLES

CHARLES A. BEARD. Corporations and Natural Rights. *Virginia Quar. Rev.*, July.

CHARLES S. HYNEMAN. Administrative Adjudication: an Analysis [I]. *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, Sept.

RICHARD PARES. American versus Continental Warfare, 1739-63. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, July.

MURRAY KANE. Some Considerations of the Safety Valve Doctrine. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, Sept.

BAYRD STILL. An Interpretation of the Statehood Process, 1800 to 1850. *Ibid.*

F. GARVIN DAVENPORT. The Essay on *Habeas Corpus* in the Judge Sharkey Papers. *Ibid.*

French Consular Agents in the United States, 1791-1850. *Franco-Am. Rev.*, June.

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN. A Jesuit Westward Movement. *Mid-America*, July.

MARY PAUL FITZGERALD. A Jesuit Circuit Rider [Father Paul Mary Ponziglione]. *Ibid.*

MARY CANISIUS MINAHAN. James A. McMaster: a Pioneer Catholic Journalist. *Rec. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.*, June.

ROBERT C. CLARK. The Diplomatic Mission of Sir John Rose, 1871. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, July.

JEANNETTE P. NICHOLS. A Painful Lesson in Silver Diplomacy [1887]. *South Atlantic Quar.*, July.

ALPHONSE M. SCHWITALLA. Trends in Professional Education. *Educational Rec.*, July.

IDA L. SMITH. National Group Settlements. *Aerend*, Spring.

JOHN G. VANDEUSEN. The Negro in Politics. *Jour. Negro Hist.*, July.

J. FRED RIPPY. Can the United States maintain Neutrality? *South Atlantic Quar.*, July.

HJALMAR R. HOLLAND. Concerning the Kensington Rune Stone. *Minnesota Hist.*, June.

GEORGE M. STEPHENSON. The John Lind Papers. *Ibid.*

JAMES C. MALIN. Frank Heywood Hodder, 1860-1935. *Kansas Hist. Quar.*, May.

DOCUMENTS

Correspondance Intime de Gérard de Rayneval avec Hennin. *Franco-Am. Rev.*, June.

WALTER H. STOWE, ed. Additional Letters of Reverend Abraham Beach, 1772-1791. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Episcopal Church*, June.

NEW ENGLAND AND MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

Records of the Court of New Castle on Delaware. Volume II, *1681-1699, Land and Probate Abstract Only.* Edited by ALBERT COOK MYERS. (Philadelphia, The

Colonial Society of Pennsylvania, 1935, pp. 254, $10.00.) The original minutes of the court for the period have disappeared. All that survives is a manuscript volume of items respecting land titles, probate proceedings, etc., made by Delaware in 1770. The printing is from this record. The first volume of this publication appeared in 1904.

ARTICLES

CLIFFORD K. SHIPTON. Provincial Literary Leaven. *New Eng. Quar.*, June.

ROBERT R. WALCOTT. Husbandry in New England. *Ibid.*

CHARLES MAMPOTENG. The Reverend Samuel Peters, M. A., Missionary at Hebron, Connecticut, 1760-1774. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Episcopal Church*, June.

ROBERT H. LORD. The Organizer of the Church in New England [Bishop Benedict Joseph Fenwick]. *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, July.

ROBERT L. O'BRIEN. Memoir of John Carroll Chase [1849-1936]. *New Eng. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July.

VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS. Business Records of Brown Brothers & Co., New York, 1825-1880. *Bull. New York Public Library*, June.

Records of Trinity Church Parish, New York City [cont'd]. *New York Geneal. and Biog. Rec.*, July.

ROSALIE F. BAILEY. Dr. Charles McKnight, Original Member of the Society of the Cincinnati, and his Descendants [cont'd]. *Ibid.*

HARROLD E. GILLINGHAM. The First Fire Engines used in America. *New York Hist. Soc. Quar. Bull.*, July.

ARTHUR ADAMS. Richard Hancock and the Settlement of Bridgeton. *Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc.*, July.

MILTON C. WESTPHAL. Early Moravian Pietism. *Pennsylvania Hist.*, July.

AUSTIN E. HUTCHESON. Philadelphia and the Panic of 1857. *Ibid.*

RICHARD H. HEINDEL. Some Letters of Peter Stephen Du Ponceau. *Ibid.*

JUDITH ANDERSON. Anna Dickinson, Anti-Slavery Radical. *Ibid.*

FRANCIS LORETTO CONLIN. The Democratic Party in Pennsylvania from 1856 to 1865. *Rec. Am. Cath. Hist. Soc.*, June.

JOSEPH J. MEKEEL. Glimpses into Haverford Quakeriana. *Bull. Friends' Hist. Assoc.*, Spring.

MARIAN SILVEUS. Churches and Social Control on the Western Pennsylvania Frontier. *Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag.*, June.

DOCUMENTS

Letter of the Earl of Hillsborough to Sir Henry Moore, February 25, 1768. *Bull. Fort Ticonderoga Museum*, July.

ROBERT G. JOHNSON, JOSEPH S. SICKLER, eds. Strictures upon Major General Simcoe's Military Journal in the American Revolution. *Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc.*, July.

LELAND D. BALDWIN, ed. Orders issued by General Henry Lee during the Campaign against the Whiskey Insurrectionists. *Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag.*, June.

EDWARD D. SNYDER and ANNA B. HEWITT, eds. Letters of John Greenleaf Whittier [1842-1892]. *Bull. Friends' Hist. Assoc.*, Spring.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The History of the German Friendly Society of Charleston, South Carolina, 1766-1916. Compiled from Original Sources by GEORGE J. GONGAWARE. (Richmond, Garrett and Massie, 1935, pp. xv, 226. $3.00.) It has long been recognized that the German element has made important racial and cultural contributions to the life of Charleston. German immigrants appeared in the city in considerable numbers during the second quarter of the eighteenth century, and this original group has been more or less constantly recruited by fresh arrivals until recent years. There are evidences on all sides of significant achievements by these people in commerce, in civic affairs, in religion, and in music. German is

the only language other than English which has ever had a wide usage among Charlestonians, and a German newspaper, *The Deutsche Zeitung*, is the only foreign-language paper which has had an extended duration. But the exact nature of the German influence is little understood, though historical materials are not lacking. The records of St. John's Lutheran Church, the oldest of the organized German congregations of Charleston, are complete, or nearly so; those of four other Lutheran churches are probably carefully preserved; one notable diary of a German citizen is in the possession of the South Carolina Historical Society; the records of a number of private families and business houses are known to exist; and those of social societies are accessible. The importance of Dr. Gongaware's work lies in the fact that it is the first careful study of one of these organizations, which has been, perhaps more than any other, a focus of activities of the German people of Charleston. His faithful synopsis of its records of a century and a half will call attention to a rich and unworked field. J. H. Easterby.

History of Texas, 1673-1779, by Fray Juan Agustín Morfi, Missionary, Teacher, Historian. Translated, with Biographical Introduction and Annotations, by Carlos Eduardo Castañeda. Two parts. [Quivira Society.] (Albuquerque, the Society, 1935, pp. 242; 243-496.) The present work makes known for the first time an important source for the history of Texas. For decades the *Memorias para la Historia de Texas* of the priest, Juan Agustín Morfi, still in manuscript, has been known to scholars working in the field. They were also aware of references to a *Historia de Texas* by the same author. In January, 1931, Mr. Castañeda fortunately discovered in the National Library of Mexico the manuscript of the latter work, which, though left unfinished by the tireless author, forms a welcome accession to the chronicles of early Texas. In the preface and biographical introduction to his painstaking translation Mr. Castañeda shows the difference between the two works of Morfi and the value of the *Historia*. With the assistance of colleagues at the University of Texas and of members of the Quivira Society he has now made this work available in English. In addition to a preface and biographical introduction, the editor has prepared a brief list of Morfi's writings and letters, and presents an extensive bibliography of printed works and manuscripts used in his compilation. His index is complete and accurate. His most significant contribution, however, is to be found in the numerous notes that accompany each of the ten chapters into which he has divided the narrative. These notes are meticulous in detail, although he might have referred more extensively to numerous periodical articles and monographs to illustrate portions of the text. An outline map of early Texas helps materially in locating the numerous places mentioned. The two volumes are attractively printed on fine paper in a restricted edition of five hundred copies. I. J. Cox.

ARTICLES

Edward E. Lewis. Land Tenure Changes in the South. *Am. Ec. Rev.*, Sept.

Lawrence C. Wroth. The St. Mary's Press: a New Chronology of American Printing. *Maryland Hist. Mag.*, June.

W. Stull Holt. Charles Carroll. *Ibid.*

William S. Rusk. Benjamin H. Latrobe and the Classical Influence in his Work. *Ibid.*

J. Louis Kuethe, ed. A List of Maryland Mills, Taverns, Forges, and Furnaces of 1794. *Ibid.*

O. F. Northington, jr. The Taverns of Old Petersburg, Virginia. *William and Mary College Quar.*, July.

JAMES M. OWENS. The Site of the First Eventful Failure of Lord Cornwallis. *Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog.*, July.

R. L. PARKER. R. E. Lee and the Secession of Virginia. *Aerend*, Summer.

JOSÉ MIGUEL GALLARDO. The Spaniards and the English Settlement in Charles Town. *South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, July.

E. MERTON COULTER. Edward Telfair. *Georgia Hist. Quar.*, June.

ROBERTA F. CASON. The Loyal League in Georgia. *Ibid.*

GEORGE W. PIERSON. Alexis de Tocqueville in New Orleans. *Franco-Am. Rev.*, June.

MARK F. BOYD. The Fortifications at San Marcos de Apalache. *Florida Hist. Quar.*, July.

EDGAR L. PENNINGTON. Some Experiences of Bishop Young [1820-1885]. *Ibid.*

HAROLD SCHOEN. The Free Negro in the Republic of Texas [II]. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, July.

R. L. BIESELE. Prince Solms's Trip to Texas, 1844-1845. *Ibid.*

DOCUMENTS

Pioneer Life in the Shenandoah Valley: the Common-Place Book of Margaret Lewis. *Hist. Soc. Northwestern Ohio Quar. Bull.*, July.

ELIZABETH G. MCPHERSON, ed. Letters of William Tatham [II, to Jefferson, Madison, and Wilson Cary Nicholas]. *William and Mary College Quar.*, July.

DAVID K. JACKSON, ed. Some Unpublished Letters of T. W. White to Lucien Minor [cont'd]. *Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag.*, July.

WILLIAM B. MCGROARTY, ed. Dabney H. Maury on Longstreet. *Ibid.*

MRS. LYON G. TYLER, ed. Letters from Tyler Trunks [cont'd]. *Ibid.*

MARJORIE STRATFORD MENDENHALL, ed. Recollections of Southern Plantation Life, by Henry William Ravenel. *Yale Rev.*, Summer.

DOROTHY DODD, ed. Letters from East Florida, 1843. *Florida Hist. Quar.*, July.

WESTERN TERRITORIES AND STATES

ARTICLES

GEORGE L. ANDERSON. Western Attitude toward National Banks, 1873-74. *Miss. Valley Hist. Rev.*, Sept.

ERNEST E. EAST. The "Peoria Truce": Did Douglas ask for Quarter? *Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc.*, Apr.

HARRY E. PRATT. Abraham Lincoln in Bloomington, Illinois. *Ibid.*

PAUL M. ANGLE. Basic Lincolniana. *Bull. Abraham Lincoln Assoc.*, June.

DOUGLAS C. MCMURTRIE. Early Illinois Copyright Entries, 1821-1850. *Bull. Chicago Hist. Soc.*, June.

KATE L. GREGG. Building of the First American Fort West of the Mississippi [Fort Bellefontaine]. *Missouri Hist. Rev.*, July.

RUBY W. WALDECK. Missouri in the Spanish-American War [I]. *Ibid.*

J. O. VAN HOOK. Mexican Land Grants in the Arkansas Valley. *Southwestern Hist. Quar.*, July.

BESSIE L. LYON. Jasons of 1860. *Palimpsest*, July.

WILLIAM J. PETERSEN. Regulating the Lead Miners. *Ibid.*

W. A. TITUS. The Westward Trail [cont'd]. *Wisconsin Mag. Hist.*, June.

WILLIAM F. RANEY. The Building of Wisconsin Railroads. *Ibid.*

GEORGE A. ROOT. Ferries in Kansas: Arkansas River [concl'd]. *Kansas Hist. Quar.*, May.

LELA BARNES. Isaac McCoy and the Treaty of 1821. *Ibid.*

A. C. SHALLENBERGER. The Last Pawnee-Sioux Indian Battle and Buffalo Hunt. *Nebraska Hist. Mag.*, July, 1935 [printed July, 1936].

EDWARD RING. The Episcopalian Diocese of Colorado. *Colorado Mag.*, July.

EDWARD DAVIS. Early Advancement among the Five Civilized Tribes. *Chron. Oklahoma*, June.

JAMES D. MORRISON. Union Pacific, Southern Branch. *Ibid.*

MURIEL H. WRIGHT. Contributions of Indian People to Oklahoma. *Ibid.*

T. C. Elliott. The Coming of the White Women. *Oregon Hist. Quar.*, June.

W. R. H. Hodgkin. Beginnings of the Church on the Pacific Coast. *Hist. Mag. Prot. Episcopal Church*, June.

Samuel F. Cohn. Martial Law in Washington Territory. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, July.

Report concerning the Birth Date of Kamehameha I. *Forty-fourth Annual Rep. Hawaiian Hist. Soc.*, 1935.

Bernice Judd. Koloa: a Sketch of its Development. *Ibid.*

DOCUMENTS

E. R. Ott, ed. Selections from the Diary and Gazette of Father Pierre Potier, S. J., 1708-1781. *Mid-America*, July.

Milo M. Quaife, ed. Governor Shelby's Army in the River Thames Campaign. *Filson Club Hist. Quar.*, July.

Fern Nance Pond, ed. The Memoirs of James McGrady Rutledge, 1814-1899. *Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc.*, Apr.

Early Evangelism in Chicago, 1833: a Letter written by Jeremiah Porter. *Bull. Chicago Hist. Soc.*, June.

Letters of Richard Emerson Ela [cont'd]. *Wisconsin Mag. Hist.*, June.

Bertha L. Heilbron, ed. Journal of a Canoe Voyage from the Falls of St. Anthony to St. Louis [cont'd]. *Minnesota Hist.*, June.

Letters of a Kansas Pioneer, 1855-1860 [Thomas C. Wells]. *Kansas Hist. Quar.*, May.

Indian Office Documents on Sioux-Pawnee Battle. *Nebraska Hist. Mag.*, July, 1935 [printed July, 1936].

Paul Nesbitt, ed. Governor Haskell tells of Two Conventions [Statehood and Constitutional Conventions, 1905]. *Chron. Oklahoma*, June.

Lansing B. Bloom, ed. Bourke on the Southwest [X]. *New Mexico Hist. Rev.*, July.

Harold C. Vedeler, ed. The Reminiscences of Murdoch M. McPherson. *Pacific Northwest Quar.*, July.

Spalding and Whitman Letters, 1837 [Letters of H. H. Spalding and Marcus Whitman relative to their missions]. *Oregon Hist. Quar.*, June.

E. Ruth Rockwood, ed. Letters of Charles Stevens [cont'd]. *Ibid.*

A. Francis Judd, ed. Lunalilo, the Sixth King of Hawaii: Contemporary Letters. *Forty-fourth Annual Rep. Hawaiian Hist. Soc.*, 1935.

LATIN-AMERICAN HISTORY

W. S. Robertson

Who's Who in Latin America: a Biographical Dictionary of the Outstanding Living Men and Women of Spanish America and Brazil. Edited by Percy Alvin Martin. Assistant Editor, Manoel da Silveira Soares Cardozo. (Stanford University, University Press, 1935, pp. xxiv, 438, $6.50.) Professor Martin has rendered a distinct service in collecting a series of biographical sketches of leading living Latin Americans. This is the first attempt in any language to bring together biographies of outstanding personalities of the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking regions of America. Within a limited space much choice had to be exercised, and the list of those chosen from each country may be criticized for its omissions. In making the selections, however, Dr. Martin had the advice of a large number of persons who are conversant with the several countries, so that the group of individuals included from each nation is a decidedly representative one. The 1319 sketches are not distributed in proportion to the population of the republics. For example, the five countries having the largest number of sketches are Argentina, 212; Brazil, 170; Mexico, 150; Chile, 117; and Colombia, 111. Comparison of these numbers with the population of the countries shows that the respective ratios are 1:57,000, 1:258,000, 1:110,000,

1:37,000 and 1:84,000. The large number of natives and residents of the several capitals and the large proportion of diplomats and government officials included in the volume are to be noticed. Nevertheless, most lines of human endeavor are represented. Unfortunately, the rapidly shifting political scene of the Latin-American nations serves to make a work of this character quickly out of date. Withal, this *Who's Who* should be most useful to those interested in Latin-American affairs. ROSCOE R. HILL.

Histoire de l'Amérique Espagnole. By H. D. BARBAGELATA. (Paris, Colin, 1936.) A survey prepared under the direction of the Institut des études américaines.

Boletín de la junta de historia y numismática americana. Volume VIII. (Buenos Aires, Rodríguez Giles, 1936.) This contains useful monographs and essays on various phases of Spanish-American history.

La junta de historia y numismática americana: Breve noticia histórica. By E. DE GANDÍA. (Buenos Aires, Imprenta de la Universidad, 1935.) A pamphlet which narrates the history and the activities of one of the most important historical societies in South America.

His Majesty, the President of Brazil. By E. HAMBLOCH. (New York, Dutton, 1936.) This is a study of Brazilian constitutional history.

Homenaje al Libertador, José de San Martín. By R. LEVENE. (Buenos Aires, 1935.) This estimate of San Martín's services is the first in a series of pamphlets published by the Museo Histórico Nacional of Buenos Aires. The second pamphlet in the series, by the same author, *Síntesis sobre la revolución de Mayo*, describes the revolution of May, 1810, at Buenos Aires.

La vida consagrada de Mariano Moreno. By R. LEVENE. (Buenos Aires, 1936.) This is a scholarly work by a distinguished writer.

La mision Bland en Chile. By E. PEREIRA SALAS. (Santiago de Chile, Imprenta Universitaria, 1936.) An account of the visit of an American commissioner to Chile during the revolutionary period.

Las tentativas para la colocación de un empréstito Chileno en los Estados Unidos, 1818-1819. By E. PEREIRA SALAS. (Santiago de Chile, Imprenta Universitaria, 1935.) This describes an episode in the financing of the first Chilean Revolution.

ARTICLES

G. ARCILA ROBLEDO. Aspecto cristiano del Libertador. *Bol. Hist. y Antig.*, Feb.

C. V. AUBRUN. Bolivar et la révolution américaine. *Bull. Hispanique*, Apr.

E. G. COLLADO and S. G. HANSON. Old Age Pensions in Uruguay. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, May.

E. DE GANDÍA. Las dos fundaciones de Buenos Aires. *Rev. Españas*, Jan.

F. GONZÁLEZ RUÍZ. Un gran caudillo de la conquista: Don Pedro de Valdivia. *Ibid.*

T. R. HAY. Charles Williamson and the Burr Conspiracy. *Jour. Southern Hist.*, May.

G. HERNÁNDEZ DE ALBA. Historia y etnología de las tribus guajiras. *Bol. Hist. y Antig.*, Feb.

C. IBARGUREN and OTHERS. R. B. Cunningham Graham. *Nosotros*, Apr.

J. T. LANNING. Research Possibilities in the Cultural History of Spain in America. *Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev.*, May.

V. LECUNA. El Libertador en Boyacá. *Bol. Ac. Nac. Hist.*, Jan.

O. QUELLE. Zacharias Wagner und sein Brasilienwerk: Eine Kulturgeschichtliche Studie über das Deutschtum in Brasilien. *Ibero-Amerikan. Arch.*, Apr.

F. RIVAS VICUÑA. La democracia colombiana y la conferencia de Guayaquil. *Bol. Ac. Nac. Hist.*, Jan.

B. Schatzky. La neutralité du Chili pendant la guerre mondiale. *Rev. Hist. Guerre Mond.*, Apr.

J. W. Schottelius. Die Gründung Quitos: Planung und Aufbau einer spanisch-amerikanischen Kolonialstadt. *Ibero-Amerikan. Arch.*, Apr.

C. L. Stewart. Why the Spaniards Temporarily Abandoned Nootka Sound in 1789. *Can. Hist. Rev.*, June.

J. de la Torre y del Cerro. Gonzálo Jiménez de Quesada. *Bol. Hist. y Antig.*, Feb.

M. Ugarte and Others. Encuestas de Nosotros: América y el destino de la civilización occidental. *Nosotros*, Apr.

J. R. Vejarano. La vida extraordinario de Nariño. *Bol. Hist. y Antig.*, Apr.

DOCUMENTS

Constitución del estado de la Nueva Granada dada por la convención constituyente en el año de 1832, 22° de la independencia. *Rev. Arc. Nac.*, Mar.

Constitución política de la república de la Nueva Granada, 1843. *Ibid.*

Constitución política de la Nueva Granada, 1853. *Ibid.*, Apr.

Constitución política para la confederación granadino, 1858. *Ibid.*

V. Lecuna. Documentos inéditos para la historia de Bolívar, el Libertador en Nueva Granada, 1814-1815. *Bol. Ac. Nac.*, Jan.

Relación del estado del virreinato de Santafé hecha por el exmo. señor José de Solis al exmo. señor Zarda, año de 1760. *Rev. Arc. Nac.*, Mar.

HISTORICAL NEWS

The Board of Editors of the *American Historical Review* and the members of the American Historical Association owe a deep debt of gratitude to Dr. Henry E. Bourne, who retired from the managing editorship of the *Review* on July 1, 1936, after seven years of devoted service. During a period of financial stringency, when some curtailment was unavoidable and his own labors were measurably increased, Dr. Bourne maintained unimpaired the high standards of the *Review*. More than that, he endeared himself to all by his tact, unfailing fairness, and sympathetic handling of the problems that came before him.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The new address of the general office of the Association is now 509 Union Trust Building, 740 Fifteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

The Fifty-first Annual Meeting of the Association will be held in Providence on December 29, 30, and 31. The headquarters will be the Biltmore Hotel. Professor Robert H. George is chairman of the committee on local arrangements. Though the details of the program are not yet complete, Professor James B. Hedges, chairman of the program committee, informs us that the broad outlines have assumed final form. There are to be two general sessions, one devoted to a discussion of the Religious Factor in Modern European History, and the other to a critical evaluation of the History of American Life series, edited by Fox and Schlesinger.

In European history there will be sessions on Ancient History, Medieval History, Modern England, the Thirty Years' War, the Old Regime, and European Interests and Activities in Africa. In American history there will be two sessions on Colonial History, one of which will observe appropriately the tercentenaries of the founding of Harvard College and of Rhode Island. A session on Canadian-American Relations will afford an opportunity for the presentation of significant results of the survey that is being carried out under the auspices of the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace; papers will deal with the intermingling of the two populations, the interplay of the two economies, and interrelations of a political and governmental nature. The general theme of the session on American Diplomatic History will be the Interpretation of our Entrance into the World War. There will be a session on the History of the South. Plans have been made for joint sessions with various affiliated societies, including the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, the Agricultural History Society, the Conference of State and Local Historical Societies, the American Society of Church History.

The following should be added to the *List of Research Projects in History*, published as a supplement to Volume XXXIX, No. 3, of the *American Historical Review*:

XVIII. United States of America

(1) General

American Attitude toward England, 1783-1823. Prog. Edward H. Tatum, jr., *Huntington Library*.

Historiography of the Monroe Doctrine. Prog. *Id.*

(4) Foreign Affairs

Diplomatic History in East Asia, 1898-1906. Prog. John Gilbert Reid, Washington, D. C.

(8) The United States (Since 1782)

Biography of Edwin M. Stanton. Prog. A. Howard Meneely, *Dartmouth*.

OTHER HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: a typewritten monograph by Arthur Robb of the Department of Justice on the founding of the city of Washington; letters of Dr. Daniel Turner of Rhode Island, physician at St. Mary's, Georgia, 1804-1808; seven volumes of additional papers of Benjamin B. French, 1826-1870; copies of some sixty letters of Charles Stevens, emigrant from Illinois to Oregon, 1837-1895; two scrapbooks of articles contributed to periodicals, mostly letters from Washington, by Mary Abigail Dodge ("Gail Hamilton"), 1859-1864; additional papers of Benjamin Harrison, Robert G. Ingersoll, and Brand Whitlock; and thirty-three file-drawers of papers of Colonel House's "Inquiry" preliminary to the peace negotiations of 1919 at Paris, preserved and presented by Dr. Hunter Miller.

The National Archives announces the appointments of Miss Irene A. Wright as special examiner, Dr. Edmond S. Meany as assistant classifier, and Dr. Edward F. Rowse as assistant in department archives. Some thirteen hundred logbooks of ships of the navy, ranging from 1801 to 1861, have been transferred to the National Archives from the Bureau of Navigation (224 cubic feet). In addition to entries concerning the location and course of the ship, they contain notes on interesting events and observations at sea and on shore. Another series of logbooks containing engineering data recorded on steam vessels of the navy from 1861 to 1924, together with the correspondence and other records of the old Bureaus of Equipment and of Steam Engineering from 1885 to 1910, have been received from the Bureau of Engineering of the Navy Department (2518 cubic feet). Other recent accessions include: papers filed by attorneys and others in cases in the old Circuit Court of the District of Columbia, now the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, from about 1810 to 1863 (115 cubic feet); field notes, field and office computations, and station records of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from 1817 to 1934 (1421 cubic feet); records of

weather observations on ocean-going ships from 1850 to 1893, made for the Hydrographic Office, and records of kite, balloon, and surface meteorological observations of the Weather Bureau ranging from 1871 to 1934 (665 cubic feet); correspondence of the Lighthouse Board, now the Bureau of Lighthouses, from 1859 to 1910 (344 cubic feet); correspondence, journals, notebooks, and logbooks of the Bureau of Fisheries and its predecessor, the Fish Commission, from 1871 to 1906 (206 cubic feet); correspondence and reports concerning experiments of the Bureau of Aircraft Production with the use of destructive gases from 1917 to 1919 (3 cubic feet); records of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and of the Special Adviser to the President on Foreign Trade, 1934 and 1935 (170 cubic feet); and records of the National Labor Board and the National Labor Relations Board from August 6, 1933, to August 27, 1935 (116 cubic feet). The *First Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States, 1934-1935*, has been published, covering the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935 (Washington, 1936, pp. vii, 60).

A full assembly of the International Committee of Historical Sciences and meetings of its subcommittees were held at Bucharest on April 13-16. Unfortunately no American scholars were able to be present. Several, however, were named as members of the various subcommittees: John L. La Monte, chronology; Samuel F. Bemis, diplomatic history; Leicester Holland, iconography; R. D. W. Connor, archives; and C. O. Paullin, historical geography. Most of the subcommittees reported satisfactory progress on the work under their direction. The subcommittee on the *International Bibliography of Historical Sciences* reported that all the volumes for the period 1926-1933 had appeared, and that the volume for 1934 would be published in the autumn. The subcommittee on the history of constitutions presented the proof sheets of a second volume. A special committee was appointed to present nominations to the bureau of the international committee on the occasion of the general elections to be held at the time of the next International Congress of Historical Sciences, which will take place in Zurich in 1938, and of which a more detailed announcement will be presented in these columns in an early issue.

The subcommittee on diplomatic history has announced through its chairman, Dr. Ludwig Bittner of the Austrian archives, that the first volume, 1648-1715, of the long-expected *Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter aller Länder* will be published by the first of October (Oldenburg, G. Stalling). In this important manual, prepared by the laborious co-operation of historical scholars and archivists in many lands, the effort is made to present, from original official sources, complete lists of the diplomatic representatives sent by all governments to all governments since the time when the treaties of Westphalia regularized the status and classes of such functionaries, with exact dates of presentation of credentials and of withdrawal. The second volume will cover the period from 1716 to 1814, the third the

period from 1815 to the most recent date practicable. The usefulness of such a compilation to students of diplomatic history is obvious.

Bulletin XXX (March, 1936) of the International Committee of Historical Sciences is devoted to carefully prepared analyses of the principal historical works published in Hungarian for the period 1926-1932. For each work the Hungarian title is given, followed by a translation into French or German and by an analysis or abstract of its contents. The analyses, which are prepared with much care, and which vary in length from a few lines to a page or more, are mostly in French, although a few are in German. In this way, the most important part of the historical production in Hungarian is brought to the knowledge of scholars who are unable to use that language. The work is done under the direction of the subcommittee on publications, of which Professor Aage Friis is chairman. Later bulletins will contain similar abstracts of historical works in other languages of limited circulation.

The Berkshire (formerly Lakeville) Historical Conference held its annual meeting at the Red Lion Inn in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, on May 17, 18, and 19. Matters of interest under discussion were: (1) the establishment of exchange arrangements between members of the group and professors of history in the West, in Canada, and in England; (2) the increasing amount of preparation in educational methodology required of graduates of liberal arts colleges for teaching in public high schools.

The fourth quinquennial Anglo-American Historical Conference was held in London during the week of July 6-11 under the auspices of the University of London. Arrangements for the conference had been made by a subcommittee of the Institute of Historical Research, and Mr. Guy Parsloe, secretary of the institute, acted as secretary of the conference. Delegates were appointed by forty universities and colleges of the United States, twenty-six of the British Empire overseas, and twenty-four of the United Kingdom, and by a number of British and American societies and institutions. In addition, more than three hundred other persons interested in history accepted individual invitations to attend. The conference was organized in nine sections, dealing respectively with medieval history, diplomatic history, the history of parliamentary institutions, economic history, colonial history, local history, Slavonic history, the historical relations between Europe and the American continents, and Oriental history. At the opening meeting Viscount Sankey, formerly lord chancellor, delivered an address on "The Historian and the Lawyer: Their Aims and their Methods". There were three general meetings and twenty sectional meetings. At one of the former Professor A. J. Toynbee discoursed suggestively on the question, "Has History any Shape or Pattern?" His address was followed by prolonged discussion. Among the important papers presented at sectional meetings by British historians were those by Mr. J. N. L. Myres and Dr. R. R. Darlington on "Recent Work in Anglo-Saxon History", by Mr. H. G. Richardson on the question, "Have

Recent Studies altered the Accepted Outlines of the Early History of Parliament?", by Professor A. F. Pollard on "The Reformation Parliament as a Matrimonial Agency, and its National Effects", by Professor F. M. Powicke and Miss Helen Cam on "Aspects of the Study of Medieval Society", and by Professor R. W. Seton-Watson on "British Policy in the Near East in the Nineteenth Century". The following American historians delivered addresses or presented papers on the subjects indicated: Professor A. S. Aiton, by proxy, ("The Study of Latin-American History in the United States"), Professor H. Heaton ("Historical Relations of Europe and the United States"), Professor William E. Lingelbach ("American Democracy and Some of its European Interpreters"), Professor A. H. Lybyer ("Mohammed the Conqueror"), President John C. Merriam of the Carnegie Institution of Washington ("Methods of Research in the Field of History in Middle America"), Professor J. U. Nef ("Prices and Industrial Capitalism in France and England, 1540-1640"), Professor T. J. Wertenbaker ("The Founding of American Civilization"). The papers, as the titles indicate, were not all of the same type. Some of them were technical and addressed to specialists; others made a wider appeal. Among the latter, Professor Powicke's was especially significant, presenting as it did, with insight, humor, and subtlety, different objectives in the study of history. In general, the discussions were appropriate and worth while, though evidences of exhibitionism on the part of some participants were not wholly lacking. A full account of the proceedings of the conference, including summaries of the papers and discussions, will be published in the November issue of the *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*.

An Anglo-French Historical Conference was held at Oxford on April 16 and 17. It was divided into a medieval and a modern section. At the former a number of papers were presented by English and French historians. Professor F. M. Stenton discussed "Anglo-Norman Feudalism and the English Crown", Professor T. F. T. Plucknett "The Significance of Medieval Law Reporting", M. F. Jouon des Longrais "La portée politique des réformes d'Henri II en matière de saisine", and M. R. Fawtier "La fixité du gouvernement central en France et en Angleterre à la fin du xiii^{e} et au début du xiv^{e} siècle". In the modern section papers were read by Mr. Henry Butterfield on "Charles Fox and the French Revolution", Professor L. B. Namier on "King and Premier under the Parliamentary System", M. A. Reussner on "Les communications maritimes françaises pendant la guerre d'indépendance américaine" and M. E. Prectin on "Introduction à l'histoire des rapports réligieux entre la France et l'Angleterre de 1763 à 1848". It is proposed to hold the next meeting of the conference in Paris next year.

The annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association was held at Ottawa on May 26 and 27. Professor E. R. Adair of McGill University delivered the presidential address on "The Military Reputation of Major-

General James Wolfe". Joint sessions were held with the Canadian Political Science Association, one of which was devoted to the subject of western Canada, another to the teaching of international relations in Canadian universities. There was a round-table discussion on local history, historical societies, and archives, at which Professor D. C. Harvey and Dr. J. J. Talman, archivists of Nova Scotia and Ontario, respectively, participated. Professor Griffith Taylor, the first incumbent of the recently established chair in geography at the University of Toronto, gave an illustrated lecture on "The Ecological Approaches to European History". The following officers were elected for the current year: president, Professor C. W. New; vice-president, Professor D. C. Harvey; chairman of the management committee, Professor R. G. Trotter; English secretary and treasurer, Mr. Norman Fee; French secretary, Major Gustave Lanctot.

Under the auspices of the Centre d'Études de la Révolution française of the University of Paris a conference of historical scholars decided on June 30 to organize the Institut international de l'Histoire de la Révolution française. As the sponsors of the plan had already received more than one hundred adherents, including many from other countries than France, the conference decided to organize the institute immediately and then proceeded to hold a first session.

The American Council of Learned Societies is able to offer a limited number of small grants, ordinarily not exceeding $300, to individual scholars to assist them in carrying on definite projects of research already commenced. Applicants must possess the doctorate or its equivalent, must be citizens or permanent residents of the United States or Canada, and must be in personal need of the assistance for which they apply and unable to secure it from other sources. Further information may be obtained from the Secretary for Fellowships and Grants, American Council of Learned Societies, 907 Fifteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

On June 14 President Roosevelt dedicated the George Rogers Clark Memorial at Vincennes. It is an ambitious ensemble, including a rotunda, a monumental bridge, and a park, with statues of Clark, the Italian born Colonel Francis Vigo, and the French priest, Father Gibault, the men to whom, in the President's words, "the United States is indebted for the saving of the Northwest Territory". Clark has been the subject of many biographies, by far the best being that by James Alton James, but little is known about the other two members of the triumvirate. Professor Bruno Roselli, who has resided for many years in the United States, is the author of an informative biography of Vigo, entitled *Vigo, a Forgotten Builder of the American Republic,* which may have had something to do with the decision of the George Rogers Clark Memorial Commission to include a statue of Vigo in the Vincennes project. Father Gibault still awaits a biographer.

Kenneth Chorley, President of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., announced on August 3 that its Education Department and Research and Record Department had been combined. The new department is called the Department of Research and Education; Mr. Harold R. Shurtleff will be director, and Mr. T. Rutherfoord Goodwin will be manager of the education division.

A new annual law periodical, the *University of Toronto Law Journal*, published by the University of Toronto Press, made its appearance last year. In a foreword to the first number (Lent Term, 1935) Professor W. P. M. Kennedy, Chairman of the Editorial Board, expresses the hope that the *Journal* will contain contributions not merely on common-law subjects, but also on comparative law, public law, international law, and on legal developments in the British Empire and the United States. An article in the second (1936) number is listed on page 176.

The editorship of the *Historische Zeitschrift* has been transferred from Friedrich Meinecke to Karl Alexander von Müller, of the University of Munich. The change denotes one of editorial policy, from that of indifference to political or religious creed to that of support of National Socialism. In a preface to the first issue of the journal for 1935-1936 (vol. CLIII) the new editor assures the reader that the exact methods of historical investigation will be preserved, but that the *Historische Zeitschrift* will bring the study of history back into intimate contact with the nation and will help the nation in building a new civilization and in asserting Germany's position in the world. The *kleindeutsch* attitude is to be replaced by a *gesamtdeutsch* one, and historical studies of problems which confront the German folk in the present age are to be particularly emphasized. Scientific accuracy, says the editor, is to be combined with the Nazi program; the finest ideals of the older historical writers are to be fructified by union with the living reality of Nazi Germany. Younger historians are to be especially encouraged to publish in the *Zeitschrift*, and the editor expects with confidence that a new great age of German historiography will begin. As evidence of the Nazification of the *Historische Zeitschrift*, one notices in the volume for 1935-1936, the first year under the new editorship, a long article by E. Hölzle entitled "Volks- und Rassenbewusstsein in der englischen Revolution" and one by W. Grau on "Geschichte der Judenfrage".

In the same issue there is published an address by Walter Frank, delivered at the opening of the Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands. This institute has replaced the Historische Reichskommission and is directed by Dr. Frank. The change signals another expansion of National Socialism into the learned world. Dr. Frank is well known as the author of an excellent study of Stöcker and ranked among the abler of the younger German historians. That he is an ardent and active Nazi goes without saying. Dr. Frank begins his address by condemning academic aloofness from

public life. He quotes with approval Treitschke's statement, "The patriot in me is a thousand times stronger than the professor!", and concludes his speech as follows: "A great front will arise in which there will no longer be technical experts in different fields and professional politicians, but in which we will all form, on different fields of battle and with different weapons, one great guild fighting the same war, the war for a new period of German greatness." To achieve this objective the historian must find his way back to the nation, as Frank and the Nazis have done. He must maintain "living contact with the great reality of the fold". In doing so, he must not try to compete with the newspapers and party speeches; he should write, rather, for the leaders of the nation. Frank expects that "the march of the storm columns and the song of the masses and the lonely struggling of the investigator and the artist will create tones which without compulsion will blend into one great German symphony". He denies that this historical writing will be Nazi party propaganda and states that the same movement which brought forth the Nazis has produced this need of reform as well. He credits Adolf Hitler with the revival of German culture and states the new ideals of German scholarship as follows: "To be German means to be earnest; to be German means to be thorough; to be German means to be conscientious; to be German means to go to the bottom of things, even when one goes to ruin thereby." Every objection to this faith, he writes, will be regarded as "a revolt of insolent slaves who must be beaten down with the whip". The new institute differs in its organization from the former Reichskommission in two respects: It is composed of leaders from "practical life" as well as of historians; it has associated a large number of younger historians in its work. Its editorial policy, also, is different. It will concentrate attention upon the period between the French Revolution and the Nazi revolution and will begin with four topics: "A History covering the period between 1789 and 1848 of the Coming of Western Ideas into Germany and the Effects and Countereffects which they Aroused, A History of the National Church Movement in the Nineteenth Century, A History of Philosophy, especially in the Nineteenth Century, and A History of the German Jewish Question from the French Revolution to the National Socialist Revolution". Frank expects that these four subjects will require a decade of study, and he announces that "hundreds" of others in the history of this period will also be dealt with. He assures the public that "this spiritual renaissance cannot be ordered, that it must grow naturally". And he consoles those who take up learning instead of an active political or military career with the assurance that "if we possess the force to write histories again so that the makers of history will carry them in their packs, then we also have made history".

The British Academy has published (London, Humphrey Milford), as advance pamphlets from its *Proceedings*, a monograph by Bernard Ashmole,

well illustrated, on *Late Archaic and Early Classical Greek Sculpture in Sicily and South Italy;* a learned article by Professor Thomas F. O'Rahilly on the *Goidels and their Predecessors,* arguing for a pre-Goidelic invasion of Bretonic Celts into Great Britain and Ireland; an interesting lecture by V. H. Galbraith on the *Literacy of the Medieval Kings;* and one by Professor Previté-Orton on *Marsilius of Padua.*

An article entitled "Research in Medieval Legal History of the Jews" has recently been reprinted from the *Proceedings* of the American Academy for Jewish Research, vol. VI (1934-1935). The author, Dr. Guido Kisch, was formerly Professor Ordinarius in the History of Law in the Universities of Königsberg, Prague, and Halle, where he specialized in the legal history of the Jews in the Middle Ages. His purpose in this article is "to call attention to an important branch of Jewish history which has so far been sadly neglected and to stimulate more intensive researches in this field".

Announcement has been made of the forthcoming publication by H. M. Stationery Office of the first volume of the monumental *History of Parliament* projected several years ago. In 1929 the prime minister appointed a committee presided over by Colonel Josiah Wedgwood, M.P., and including a number of distinguished historical scholars, to examine the materials available for a record of the personnel and politics of members of the House of Commons from 1264 to 1832. The committee reported that the preparation of such a record was practicable and desirable. It was subsequently resolved at a joint meeting of both houses of Parliament to proceed with the enterprise on a larger scale as a History of Parliament, and a committee under the chairmanship of Lord Salisbury has been carrying on research for more than three years. In the prospectus issued by the Stationery Office it is announced that the work will fall into seventeen or eighteen periods, for each of which the material will be presented in two or three volumes comprising (1) biographies of members of the House of Commons, with a commentary on the facts disclosed therein; (2) lists of members of both houses in each Parliament, showing by-elections and the numbers voting in each contested election; (3) conclusions, appendixes, documents, debates, etc., illustrating the growth of Parliament. As a preface to each Parliament there will be a commentary on its composition and work, and an introduction will summarize the information gathered from the lists. It is intended to publish volumes from time to time as funds for research and compilation become assured from private sources; the selling price will be fixed to cover the cost of printing and publication only. The *History* will probably run to some forty volumes, and its preparation and publication may extend over thirty years or so. The first volume to appear, which is expected to be published this autumn, will be the first of a group on the period from 1439 to 1509.

In a recent number of the *Revue d'histoire des colonies françaises* (1936, no. 2) Paul Roussier has begun the publication of the letters of General Leclerc to the First Consul and the minister of the marine during the expedition to Santo Domingo (listed on p. 179). He has found 127 letters of Leclerc in the archives of the ministries that had to deal with various phases of the affair, many more than have hitherto been listed. He believes that only by studying the immediate reactions of the general to the increasing difficulties of the situation can any fair estimate be made of Leclerc's conduct. In addition to a critical introduction M. Roussier publishes in this number only the official notes which were to serve as Leclerc's instructions and a letter of the First Consul to the "Citoyen Toussaint-Louverture, général en chef".

Proposals concerning the revision of textbooks of history and geography which were formulated by a committee of Argentine scholars have been approved by Señor Federico Iriondo, Argentine minister of justice and public instruction. The committee was appointed by the Argentine government in accordance with a stipulation in the recent agreement between Argentina and Brazil providing for the excision from such textbooks of all topics that might in any manner arouse ill will between the peoples of America.

The Inter-American Historical Series, which is to be composed of translations of notable histories of Latin-American countries by national historians, will begin to issue from the University of North Carolina Press during the present autumn. The first volume in the series, a translation by Professor William Spence Robertson of the University of Illinois of Señor Ricardo Levene's *Lecciones de Historia Argentina,* is now in press.

The University of Minnesota Press announces the reissue of John D. Hicks's book, *The Populist Revolt: a History of the Farmers' Alliance and the People's Party,* originally published in 1931.

The *Proceedings* of the Vermont Historical Society, after a suspension of three years, has resumed publication. The March number is chiefly devoted to recording the activities of the society during this period.

PERSONAL

Parker Thomas Moon, though only forty-four years of age at the time of his sudden death on June 11, was a recognized authority on the history of international relations. Graduated from Columbia College with highest honors in 1913, he began his teaching career there two years later as an instructor in history. During the World War he was a member of Colonel House's Commission of Inquiry, and he acted as secretary of the International Commission on Territorial Problems at the Paris Peace Conference. Returning to Columbia, he received the doctorate in history in 1921 with a noteworthy dissertation on *The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic*

Movement in France. In the same year he was chosen managing editor of the *Political Science Quarterly*, a position which he held to the time of his death, and for which his broad knowledge of current events, his high scholarly ideals, and his discriminating literary sense eminently qualified him. In 1925 he was appointed to the newly established chair of international relations in the Department of Public Law in Columbia. A brilliant and inspiring lecturer, Dr. Moon was also a painstaking director of the research of advanced graduate students, who always found in him a sympathetic guide, philosopher, and friend. His *Imperialism and World Politics* (1926) is a standard work that gave him a national reputation, and at the time of his death he was completing a detailed analysis of French foreign policy since the war. He was active in the work of the American Catholic Historical Association and served as its president in 1926. Since 1931 he had been president of the Catholic Association for International Peace, for which he wrote a number of pamphlets. He was joint author of a popular series of textbooks on European history.

Stella Kramer, who died at Cincinnati on July 5, was an authority on the English medieval craft gilds. She took her bachelor's and master's degrees at the University of Cincinnati and was the first woman to receive the doctorate in English history at Columbia. Her dissertation, *The English Craft Gilds and the Government*, was published in 1905 by the Columbia University Press, which also brought out her *English Craft Gilds: Studies in their Progress and Decline* (1927). Miss Kramer studied at Oxford and the Sorbonne and traveled widely in Europe. Her last book, *A Path to Understanding* (1933), deals with problems of education, in which she took a deep interest.

After a long and painful illness, borne with great fortitude, Charles Henry Hull died at Ithaca, New York, on July 16. Born at Ithaca in 1864, he was graduated from Cornell University in 1886 and was thereupon appointed assistant librarian in the same institution. After serving in this position for four years, he went to Germany and spent two years (1890-1892) of study at the Universities of Göttingen, Berlin, and Halle, receiving the Ph. D. in economics from the last named. Returning immediately to his alma mater, he taught political economy and political science there until 1901, when he was appointed to the chair of American history, which he filled for exactly thirty years. For some years he was dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. His principal work, an edition of *the Economic Writings of Sir William Petty*, was acclaimed for its solution of a difficult literary problem and for the brilliant essay on statistics in the introduction. Hull also did much work on the *Manual of Historical Literature* published by Charles Kendall Adams, work for which he received no public acknowledgment. He traveled widely, and few men knew the nooks and corners

of Europe as he did. He was distinguished by modesty, quiet competence, and sound judgment. On the merits of a book, the qualifications of a candidate for a professorship, or, for that matter, the safety of an investment, he could give the best opinion of any.

Vasil N. Zlatarski, Bulgaria's greatest historian, died after a long illness on December 15, 1935, in his sixty-ninth year, just as he was getting ready for publication the fourth volume of his great *Geschichte der Bulgaren von der Gründung des bulgarischen Reiches bis zur Türkenzeit,* the first volume of which appeared in 1918, the second in 1927, and the third in 1934, carrying the work to 1187. There were to have been five volumes, covering the period from 679 to the Turkish conquest. At the time of his death Zlatarski ranked as the leading authority in his field, a worthy successor of Drinov, Jireček, and Bury, and was the founder of the contemporary school of Bulgarian historiography. Zlatarski was a prolific writer during the forty years of his historical career; most of his work, however, appeared in periodicals. He was president of the committee of organization of the Fourth Byzantine Congress, held in Sofia in 1934, vice-president of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, and member of many Bulgarian and foreign learned societies.

Oswald Spengler died suddenly in Munich on May 8 in the fifty-seventh year of his age. *Der Untergang des Abendlandes,* published in 1918 and in due time translated into all the major European languages, raised him from the obscurity of an unknown *gymnasium* teacher to world-wide fame, for he became the most widely read and discussed historical philosopher of our day. The English translation of his magnum opus, entitled *The Decline of the West,* was reviewed in this journal (XXXII, 826-828; XXXIV, 556-558) by Professor Earl E. Sperry. The extraordinary vogue which the book enjoyed in Germany is to be accounted for partly, no doubt, by its dominant thesis, namely, that western civilization is approaching its end; there was some consolation in the thought that if Germany had fallen, her enemies, too, were doomed, doomed by the inexorable inner necessity that determines the course of every culture from its cradle to its grave. Everywhere, however, the astonishing range of Spengler's information, his powers of synthesis, and his suggestiveness made a great impression, though critics were not slow to question the validity of his leading doctrines—the organic character of historic cultures, the cyclical recurrence of stages and periods in their evolution, historic destiny, and the possibility of predicting the course of our civilization from the history of its predecessors. The historically initiated, conscious of the complexity of historic processes and of our relatively slight knowledge of the history of preceding cultures, were not impressed by the self-confidence and dogmatism with which the author drew his analogies and announced his conclusions. A later book of Spengler's, *Jahre der Entscheidung* (translated into English with the title *The Hour of De-*

cision), raises doubt as to the consistency of his philosophy of history, for if, as had been maintained in the earlier book, the course of every culture is predetermined by the conditions of its existence, and human volition is impotent to alter it, how can there be any such thing as an hour, or a year, of decision?

Sir Richard Lodge, the well-known historian, died in London on August 2 at the age of eighty. He was educated at Balliol College, Oxford, where he won a first class in modern history in 1877. After serving as lecturer and tutor at Brasenose College from 1878 to 1894, he became the first professor of history at Glasgow University. In 1899 he was appointed professor of history at Edinburgh University, where he taught until 1925, when he retired as professor emeritus. He was president of the Royal Historical Society during the years 1929-1933. He was a frequent contributor to the *English Historical Review* and other journals, and his writings were widely known in historical circles in England and America. His principal books were *Richelieu* (a volume in the Foreign Statesmen Series), *The History of England from the Restoration to the Death of William III* (in the *Political History of England,* edited by Hunt and Poole), *Great Britain and Prussia in the Eighteenth Century,* and *Studies in Eighteenth Century Diplomacy.*

Charles Benoist, who died on August 12 at the age of seventy-five, was not primarily a historian, but his interest in public questions led him to a study of their historical background. He began his career as a journalist on the staff of the *Temps,* and in 1894, at the invitation of Fredinand Brunetière, he became political observer for the *Révue des Deux Mondes.* From 1895 to 1919 he lectured at the *École Libre des Sciences Politiques.* He was a member of the French Institute, served as a member of the Chamber of Deputies, and represented the French Republic at The Hague from 1919 to 1924. His books include *L'état et l'église* (1892), *La crise de l'état moderne* (1897), and *La question méditerranéenne* (1928). His reminiscenses, published in three volumes in 1932-1934 as *Souvenirs de Charles Benoist, membre de l'Institut, ancien député de Paris, ancien ministre de France à la Haye,* were reviewed in our pages (XXXIX, 332-333; XL, 507-509).

A Guggenheim fellowship has been awarded to Thomas A. Brady, assistant professor of history at the University of Missouri, for work on a study of the history of the cults of the Egyptian gods in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

The Social Science Research Council has awarded the following predoctoral fellowship: Wallace E. Davies, Harvard University. C. Lowell Harriss, Columbia University, has been reappointed for the year 1936-1937.

Roland G. Bainton has been appointed Titus Street Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University. This is the chair that was held by George P. Fisher and later by Williston Walker.

The Trustees of Smith College have named Dr. Merle Curti as the first holder of the Dwight W. Morrow Chair of History. The late Mr. Morrow established this chair as an evidence of his interest in history. Mr. Curti has been professor of history at Smith since 1931.

Professor Albert Hyma of the University of Michigan, in recognition of his work on Belgian and Dutch history, was made Knight of the Order of Orange-Nassau on August 31, the birthday of Queen Wilhelmina.

Katharine Elizabeth Crane, who has been an assistant editor of the *Dictionary of American Biography* for the last five years, has been appointed assistant editor of *Social Studies.*

Announcement is made of the following promotions: *University of Chicago,* John U. Nef to be professor of economic history, James L. Cate to be assistant professor; *University of Mississippi,* P. L. Rainwater to be professor and head of the department; *Swarthmore College,* Mary Albertson and Troyer S. Anderson to be associate professors.

The following appointments may be noted: *University of Chicago,* Stringfellow Barr, of the University of Virginia, as professor during 1936-1937; *Duke University,* Charles S. Sydnor, of the University of Mississippi, as associate professor; *Emory University,* Haywood J. Pearce, jr., of Brenau College, as professor; *University of Mississippi,* Joseph J. Mathews, of Duke University, and James W. Silver, of Southwestern College, as assistant professors; *University of North Carolina,* Fletcher M. Green, of Emory University, as professor; *University of North Dakota,* Clarence H. Matterson, as acting assistant professor; *University of Vermont,* Clarence Perkins, of the University of North Dakota, as acting professor and department head for 1936-1937; *George Washington University,* Thomas A. Bailey, of Stanford University, as visiting professor of diplomatic history for 1936-1937.